University of California College of Agriculture Agricultural Experiment Station Berkeley, California

COST OF DRYING CUT FRUIT IN CALIFORNIA

by.

Alexander Joss

September, 1943

Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics
Mimeographed Report No. 85

LIBITATIVE
COLLEGE OF THE CULTURE



Page

| Table | 1. | Number of records obtained of the cost of drying apricots, apples, peaches, and pears, selected areas, California, 1942 3 |
|-------|-----|---|
| Table | 2. | Comparison of tonnage of fruit dried by operators who cooperated in the study with tonnage dried in California, 1942 |
| Table | 3. | Apricots: Summary of dry-yard costs per fresh ton and per dried hundredweight, fifty-eight dry-yards, California, 1942 |
| Table | 4. | Apricots: Distribution of fifty-eight dry-yards with respect to their total drying costs per fresh ton of fruit dried, selected areas, California, 1942 |
| Table | 5. | Apricots: Distribution of fifty-eight dry-yards with respect to their labor costs per fresh ton of fruit dried, selected areas, California, 1942 |
| Table | 6. | Freestone peaches: Summary of dry-yard costs per fresh ton and per dried hundredweight, forty dry-yards, selected areas, California, 1942 |
| Table | 7. | Freestone peaches: Distribution of forty dry-yards with respect to their total drying costs per fresh ton of fruit dried, selected areas, California, 1942 |
| Table | 8. | Freestone peaches: Distribution of forty dry-yards with respect to their labor costs per fresh ton of fruit dried, selected areas, California, 1942 |
| Table | 9. | Clingstone peaches: Summary of dry-yard costs per fresh ton and per dried hundredweight, fourteen dry-yards, Stanislaus County, California, 1942 |
| Table | 10. | Clingstone peaches: Distribution of fourteen dry-yards with respect to their total drying costs per fresh ton of fruit dried, Stanislaus County, California, 1942 |
| Table | 11. | Clingstone peaches: Distribution of fourteen dry-yards with respect to their labor costs per fresh ton of fruit dried, Stanislaus County, California, 1942 |
| Table | 12. | Pears: Summary of dry-yard costs per fresh ton and per dried hundredweight, four dry-yards, California, 1942 |
| Table | 13. | Gravenstein apples: Summary of drying costs per fresh ton and per dried ton, six driers, Sebastopel area, California, 1942 17 |
| Table | 14. | Late apples: Summary of drying costs per fresh ton and per dried ton, four driers, Sebastopol area, California, 1942 20 |
| Table | 15. | Late apples: Summary of drying costs per fresh ton and per dried ton, five driers. Watsonville area, California, 1942 20 |

| | A CONTRACT OF STATE | | |
|------|--|-----|-----|
| 120 | · | | |
| | THE RESIDENCE OF THE PARTY OF T | . 1 | |
| | Conference of Compared with the later of the Compared Services of the C | | |
| 6 - | ······································ | | |
| | the second secon | | |
| | But the property with the second of the secon | | |
| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| | and the second s | | |
| | The first term is the state of | , | 4.4 |
| | A Commence of the Artifact of the Commence of | | |
| | the state of the s | | |
| | the part of the second results of the second results of the second | , | |
| | and the state of t | | |
| | the the transfer of the state o | | |
| | | | |
| | Transfer of the state of the second of the s | , | |
| | the control of the co | | |
| , | | | |
| | minute Date being beingen being militare | | |
| | The last the training state of the contract of the second | | |
| | ation to be discussion of the contract of the | | |
| 11. | | | |
| | | | |
| | the same of the figure of the same of the | | |
| | The state of the s | | |
| 25 - | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| | to be a first of the first of t | | |
| | A PARTON OF THE LOCAL MAN TO A STATE OF THE | | |
| | and the state of t | | |
| Mr. | | | |
| | the region of the property of the second sec | | |
| | the profession of the control of the | | |
| 100 | an fata the plant of the first of the state | | |
| 2.7 | to the transfer of the contract of the contrac | | |
| | | | |
| | different and or there is action indifferences. I stopped to | . 7 | |
| | ्रास्ट्रिक कि जा व विकास कि विकास का कि | | |
| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| | | | |
| | Safer with the second to the second the seco | | |
| - 5 | स्वार्थिक के प्रोध के वाद्यार प्राप्त का ना करता, करता का ना सुक्रमार्थ के लिए के किए के प्राप्त के ना का ना सुक्रमार्थ के लिए के प्राप्त के ना का ना सुक्रमार्थ के लिए के प्राप्त के ना का ना सुक्रमार्थ के ना सुक् ना सुक्रमार्थ के ना सुक्रमार्थ के ना | | |
| , | ** * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * | | |
| | | | |
| | the state of the s | | |
| | ere ere ere er i de lige er til kommune og hande er | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | the Market and the Company of the Co | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | The state of the s | | |
| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| | | | |

| | Page | |
|-----------|--|--|
| Table 16. | Comparison of rental charges with depreciation and interest on investment, ll selected apple driers, Sebastopol and Watson-ville areas, California, 1942 | |
| Table 17. | Tonnage of apricots dried, by varieties, selected areas, California, 1942 | |
| Table 18. | Tonnage of freestone peaches dried, by varieties, selected areas, California, 1942 | |
| Tablo 19. | Analysis of variance of drying ratios of apricots, by varieties, California, 1942 | |
| Table 20. | Analysis of variance of drying ratios of freestone peaches, by varieties, California, 1942 | |
| Table 21. | Tonnage of all fruit dried, 81 dry-yards, selected areas, California, 1942 | |
| Table 22. | Average investment in drying facilities per fresh ton of fruit dried, 80 dry-yards, selected areas, California, 1942 24 | |
| Table 23. | Average investment in drying facilities per fresh ton of fruit dried, by size of dry-yard, 1942 | |
| Table 24. | Average tonnage of fruit dried per dry-yard, 81 dry-yards, selected areas, California, 1942 | |
| Table 25. | Operator's estimates of the length of life of drying equipment, 81 dry-yards, selected areas, California, 1942 | |
| Table 26. | Relation of size of tray to original cost and length of life, 80 dry-yards, selected areas, California, 1942 | |
| Table 27. | Hours of shed, yard, and supervisory labor at different wage rates, apricots, selected areas, California, 1942 | |
| Table 28. | Hours of shed, yard, and supervisory labor at different wage rates, freestone peaches, selected areas, California, 1942 30 | |
| Table 29. | Boxes of apricots cut at different rates of pay, selected areas, California, 1942 | |
| Table 30. | Boxes of peaches cut at different rates of pay, selected areas, California, 1942 | |
| Table 31. | Average wage rates for different kinds of work, 6 selected driers, Sebastopol and Watsonville areas, California, 1942 33 | |
| Table 32. | Hours of labor required per fresh ton for drying apricots and peaches, selected areas, California, 1942 | |
| Table 33. | Labor requirements for drying pears, selected areas, California, 1942 | |
| Table 34. | Hours of labor required to dry apples, selected driers, Schastopol and Watsonville areas, California, 1942 | |

en transmin to the control of the co on the standard of the standar The second secon The second of th the state of the s n a contra de la contra del la contr

| | | Page |
|----------|--|------|
| Table 35 | Number of boxes of Bartlett pears cut per hour and amounts earned by 89 cutters during the week ending September 26, 1942, Lake County, California | 10 |
| Table 36 | . Tray equipment, 84 dry-yards, selected areas, California, 1942 | 36 |
| Table 37 | Pounds of fruit per tray reported by 81 dry-yard operators, selected areas, California, 1942 | 37 |
| Table 38 | Calculated tray capacity in relation to tonnage of apricots dried, 81 dry-yards, selected areas, California, 1942 | 37 |
| Table 39 | Calculated tray capacity in relation to tonnage of freestone peaches dried, 81 dry-yards, selected areas, California, 1942 | 39 |
| Table 40 | Utilization of apricots and peaches on farms included in study, selected areas, California, 1942 | 40 |
| Table 41 | Sulfur used per ton of apricots and peaches, 81 dry-yards, selected areas, California, 1942 | 40 |

erion in medical in the second of the second A section of the sectio

COST OF DRYING CUT FRUIT IN CALIFORNIA 1/

by Alexander Joss 2/

SUMMARY

This study presents data obtained from operators of 84 dry-yards and 11 apple driers during the 1942 drying season. These men furnished information on the cost of drying a total of 3,915 tons of apricots, 8,197 tons of freestone peaches, 1,377 tons of clingstone peaches, 2,681 tons of pears, and 16, 693 tons of apples. All weights are given on a fresh basis.

It cost an average of \$22.96 per fresh ton to dry apricots during the 1942 season. An average of 5.44 pounds of fresh fruit were required to produce one pound of dried fruit. The average cost of drying per dry pound was therefore 6½ cents. Labor was the most important item of cost, amounting to about 77 per cent of the total.

Freestone peaches cost an average of \$13.21 per fresh ton. The freestone peaches dried away at a ratio of 6.69 to 1, resulting in a drying cost of 4.42 cents per dry pound. Again, labor was the most important single item of cost, averaging about three fourths of the total.

Clingstone peaches cost more to dry than freestone varieties mainly because of higher cutting costs. The average cost in 14 dry-yards was \$17.41 per fresh ton or 6.34 cents a dry pound. It required an average of 7.29 fresh tons to produce one dried ton.

The apple and pear drying industry is concentrated in the hands of relatively few firms. Although records of apple-drying costs were obtained from only 11 driers, the tonnage of dried apples covered by these records represented 36 per cent of this product produced in California in 1942. Similarly, records were obtained from only four concerns that dried pears, but their combined tonnage of dried fruit represented about 16 per cent of the pears dried in the State in 1942.

Four driers in Sonoma County reported an average cost of only \$82.48 per ton of dried apples. This low cost was possible only because the drying ratio was extremely low. Because of the very high quality of the fruit handled by these four driers, only 6.67 tons of fresh apples were required to produce one ton of dried apples.

^{1/} The author wishes to acknowledge the help received during the course of this study from the following members of the Extension Service of the University of California: B. B. Burlingame, A. G. Volz, Peter T. Meyers, C. C. Barnum, H. R. Keller, N. W. Stice, R. D. McCallum, Henry L. Washburn, V. W. DeTar, Enoch Torpen, A. D. Rizzi, and J. L. Quail.

^{2/} Instructor in Agricultural Economics, Junior Agricultural Economist in the Experiment Station and Junior Agricultural Economist on the Giannini Foundation.

THE STANDARD OF THE PROPERTY OF THE TRANSPORT OF THE TRAN

M each comments of

2.3.25

| | | | THE RESERVE OF | were thank at the state of |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| 114 | garan si 1 | ក្នុងនៅស្រុក ខ្លួនក្នុង ដូចវិ | And the second of the second o | wy Sudukuś P Lie pożane proba- niek w kiest Sp |
| *inc | a theorem is the | re do tri sistem di Milia de Rifi Più parti di America di Più Più parti di America di Più | | the state of the s |
| | | 1 - 10 - 1 | | and the second of the first |
| | | | | 450 |
| | arrest to a divine | rent neget en anjone trest | | and the manual of the second |
| | | | | idis e 8. embilio gale embilio |
| | 1 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 | a ja a minas pa minas matem di atti matem | 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | .Estat |
| - 11 14 5 | 1 | | | () () () |
| 1000000 | -11 11 | e des franklik Historia Historia Historia | Al Serve Million | 11 - 11 - 11 |
| | | and the state of | A Section of | The series of the |
| | | | - J. 100 | mar - Hit steel |
| | | | | |
| | 1.171 | e II a nee g | 7 W 02 N 7 N | son railfo |
| - | | 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1 | 7 4 62 | The second of th |
| - | | 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1 | 7 4 62 | The second of th |
| 48 .55 65 .45 .57 | | | | 9 19 |
| 49 | | | | ि । । । । । । । । । । । । । । । । । । । |
| 49 | | | | ि स्टूडिंग के स |
| de la | | | | ि स्टूडिंग के स |
| 48 (3) (4) (4) (3) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) | 71 | 200 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (| | Section 12 |
| 48 (3) (4) (4) (3) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) | 71 | 200 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (| | Section 12 |
| 48 (3) (4) (4) (3) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) | 201 201 | | | Service Servic |
| de de la companya de | 201 201 | | | Section 12 |

Company of the compan

interpretation of the second control of the

The cost of drying Gravenstein apples in Sonoma County averaged \$103.96 per dry ton, with a drying ratio of 8.23 to 1. Costs were highest in the Watsonville area where they averaged \$114.68 per ton of dried apples with a drying ratio of 8.09 to 1.

The average cost for drying a ton of fresh pears was \$25.30. The drying ratio was 5.20 to 1, resulting in a cost per one hundred pounds of dried fruit of \$6.57. Labor was the biggest single item of expense accounting for slightly more than 70 per cent of the total cost.

The important factors affecting the cost of drying appear to be the ratio of fresh to dried fruit, the efficiency with which labor is used, the wage rate paid, and the average investment per ton. For apricots, the Tilton variety had the highest drying ratio, 6.35 pounds of fresh fruit per pound of dried fruit, compared with only 5.38 pounds for the Royal variety. Of the four freestone peach varieties dried, Elbertas dried away the most, 7.06 to 1,and Lovells the least, 6.44 to 1.

A variation of over 10 cents an hour was found in the wage rates paid hired labor for the shed, yard and supervisory work among the areas studied. The average wage rate was lowest (\$0.51 an hour) in Santa Clara County. The wage rate paid hired workers in the Fresno area averaged \$0.53 an hour, as compared with \$0.62 an hour in Stantislaus County.

The average investment per ton of fruit dried affects both depreciation and interest costs. The average investment per ton was lowest in Stanislaus County (\$7.76 per fresh ton) and highest in Alameda County (346.90 per fresh ton).

Any plan that contemplates the drying of a larger tonnage of apricots and freestone peaches than was dried in 1942 must take into consideration the labor, equipment, and material requirements of the task. Approximately 50 hours of labor are required per ton of fresh apricots, 21 hours per ton of fresh freestone peaches, and 29 hours per ton of clingstone peaches. Within each producing area, much of this labor is needed during a relatively short period.

If any equipment shortage occurs, it seems likely to be an insufficient number of trays. Estimates were made of the tray capacity of the dry-yards studied, and the porportion of this capacity that was used in 1942 was calculated. These calculations are intended as a guide in approximating the tonnage that can be dried within the various areas studies.

Method of Study

Before the 1942 drying season started, a number of dry-yard operators in each of the principal producing areas were contacted and their promise of cooperation obtained. With each was left a work sheet on which the cost data for the season could be entered. When the season was completed, these work sheets were collected and the data analyzed. At the time the work sheets were collected, as upplementary questionnaire was filled out. This furnished information on the acreage, production and use of certain fruit crops, the source of the fruit dried during 1942, and certain data about the dry-yard and the practices followed.

Records were obtained from the operators of 84 dry-yards and 11 apple driers. Because some of them furnished data on more than one crop, 127 individual cost records were obtained (table 1).

The first of the second se The first second second

Hand to the second of the seco

No. of the second secon

Control of the second of the s 15 15 to 1 to 1

And the second s with the first the same of the

on the control of the property of the second of the control of the

TABLE 1

Number of Records Obtained of the Cost of Drying Apricots, Apples, Peaches, and Pears, Selected Areas, California, 1942

| | | | Dry | y-yards furni | shing data on | |
|--------------|------------------------|----------|--------|----------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| County | Dry-yards reporting | Apricots | Apples | Freestone peaches | Clingstone peaches | Pears |
| Alameda | 4 | 4 | | | | 1 |
| Santa Clara | 18 | 18 | | | | |
| San Benito | 6 | 6 | | | | |
| Solano | 12 | 12 | | 2 | | |
| Contra Costa | 4 | 4 | | 1 | | |
| Stanislaus | 26 | 14 | | 26 | 14 | |
| Fresno | 6 | | | 6 | | |
| Kings | 2 | | | 2 | | |
| Tulare | 3 | | | 3 | | |
| Lake | 3 | | | | | 3 |
| Sonoma | 6 | | 6 | | | |
| Santa Cruz | 5 | | 5 | | | |
| Total | 95 | 58 | 11 | 40 | 14 | 4 |

TABLE 2

Comparison of Tonnage of Fruit Dried by Operators who Cooperated in the Study with Tonnage Dried in California, 1942

| | Dry-yards | | weight of dried* | California dried fruit | Proportion of estimated |
|---|-------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Crop | in study | Total | Per dry-yard | production, 1942 | State production in study |
| | Number | Tons | Tons | Tons | Per cent |
| Apricots Apples | 58 11 | 3,915 | | 110,000 46.000 | 3.6 36.3 |
| Freestone peaches Clingstone peaches | 40 14 | 8,197 1,377 | 98 | 110,000 22,500 | 7.5 6.1 |
| Pears | 4 | 2,691 | 673 | 16,500 | 16.3 |

^{*} Fresh weight of fruit dried for which data on costs are available.

[/] Preliminary estimates converted to fresh equivalent weights.

. 4 500.5

A CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY OF T

| | | | , m | | |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------------------|
| | | | - 4 1 | | |
| 7 1 | | | | -3 | market in the |
| | 1000 | 100 | | | |
| | *** | ** | | | |
| 11.00 | , | | | | |
| | | | | | the second second |
| | W-15 | 10 10 | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | 1 - 2 1 - 5 - |
| no fre | | | 1 - | | |
| | | | | | 4 to 11 m |
| 17 74 | | | 1 | | |
| 45 | P. 15 | | | | |
| - | | | | | |
| 6.00 | | | | | |
| | | | | | 3/1/2 |
| ~ . | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | |
| | | | | ag yas | |
| 14.4 | | | | 6 | |
| | | | | | |

L cellt

| 1-14-65 | | |
|---------|--|--|

| | | the factor of the party | | |
|--|-------|-------------------------|---|---------|
| A STATE OF THE STA | | | 12.1 | |
| 120 | 1 | 46.0 | | 80 - 17 |
| | | | | 311 |
| | - > - | | : | |
| | Ecc. | | | * |

gradiente de la composition della composition de

No attempt was made to obtain a predetermined number of cooperators or a given tonnage of fruit. The author was guided by the time limits for soliciting cooperators and the number of possible cooperators in a given area. Because of the work involved in keeping the cost records, naturally there were operators who did not care to cooperate. Some indication as to the representativeness of the sample is given in table 2. The large tonnage of apples was obtained primarily because the apple drying in the state is concentrated in two areas and in the hands of relatively few operators. On the other hand, to have obtained a larger number of pear dry-yards or a greater tonnage of appricots in the study would have necessitated considerable travel in the different pear and arricot-producing districts of the State and the soliciting of the operators of a number of very small dry-yards.

Definition of Terms

In any study of costs it is necessary to classify the many individual cost items in such a manner that they may readily be compared. To clarify the tabular material which follows, it is appropriate now to describe the procedure used in this study.

In all instances where the operator or members of his family performed any of the work connected with drying, that labor was included as a cost. The operators frequently valued their time at a slightly higher rate per hour than their regular hired help was receiving in order to reflect the operators' greater skill and ability as workers and managers.

It was possible to use the same classification of costs in the apricot and peach records. The first item shown in this classification is labor, and it is further divided into four categories. Maintenance and repair labor includes the work of getting the dry-yard ready for use, in repairing trays, boxes, and other equipment, and in storing equipment after the drying season is over. Where equipment was used for the drying of more than one crop, the cost of the maintenance and repair labor was allocated among the crops dried on the basis of their respective fresh tonnages. This principle was followed in the allocation of all joint costs. It was impossible to determine for individual dry-yards whether the repair work, particularly that on trays, was of such a nature as to apply to more than one year or not. The repair work that was done was charged as an annual expense. Some operators did comparatively little repair; others did a lot. It is felt that the average for all the yards is a fair representation of the annual repair cost under the wage conditions prevailing in 1942.

Washing trays and boxes labor included also sweeping of trays, since a few dry-yards reported trays were swept rather than washed. One dry-yard used paper tray-liners and had no labor cost of cleaning trays, although this operator felt that the not result of the use of paper was an increase in his costs. Only three dry-yards neither swept nor washed their trays in preparation for the 1942 season.

Cutting labor was a piece-work operation in all yards. When a member of the operator's family out fruit, the number of boxes cut was recorded and charged at the same rate as was paid the hired cutters. Occasionally, transportation was regularly furnished the cutters, or they were paid an additional sum each day for providing their own transportation. These costs to the operator were added to his regular cutting costs. In one small dry-yard, the shed workers helped with the cutting when they were not busy with their other duties. The number of boxes they cut was charged at the rate paid the other cutters and the amount deducted from the cost of the shed labor.

A STATE OF THE STA

A sealed of the majority of the first of the

and the state of

Here were the second of the se

entroller in the control of the cont

Shed, yard, and supervisory labor includes the remaining work on the fruit not covered in the first three categories. A separation of these costs was obtained in some yards but not in others due to the fact that workers were shifted at frequent intervals from one job to another.

Material costs need little definition. Repair material is subject to the same comment as repair labor. Some operators used a fairly large amount; others very little. Sulfur costs represent current consumption for the season regardless of the year in which purchased. Cards, knives, and miscellaneous material was a minor expense item in most yards. Some operators required the cutters to furnish their own hirves while others provided them.

Other cash costs include the use of spray rigs for washing trays, tractors for preparing the dry-yards, and trucks for hauling trays. Taxes were calculated by multiplying the assessed value of land and equipment by the county tax rate. If irrigation district taxes were levied against the dry-yard, their cost was also included. To this was added, in the case of the commercial yards, the license tax recuired of them.

Compensation insurance costs were obtained by multiplying the hired labor costs by the insurance rate. A few yards reported they carried no compensation insurance.

Fire insurance costs were obtained by applying the insurance rate to the insurance value of the property; if it were a three-year policy, one third was taken as representative of the annual cost. Few dry-yards reported carrying no fire insurance.

General expense was arbitrarily calculated at five per cent of the labor, material, and equipment cost except for one record for which complete cost accounts were kept. This procedure was followed because in a study such as this it is impossible to obtain all of the costs of drying unless the dry-ward operator keeps a complete set of cost accounts. The few detailed accounts available for analysis indicate that telephone, interest on short-term borrowing, auto expense in soliciting workers, and other similar costs averaged about five per cent of the labor, material and equipment costs.

The straight-line method of calculating depreciation was used in all cases. The operator was asked to give the original cost and his estimate of the total length of life of the following equipment: cutting sheds, sulfur houses, trays, boxes, tracks, cars, and miscellaneous equipment. The rate at which some of these items depreciate depends to a considerable degree upon the kind of treatment the dry-yard operator gives them. For example, trays, if carefully repaired and protected from the weather may last thirty or forty years; if handled roughly and discarded when broken, they may last only five years. Instead of applying a constant depreciation rate to equipment regardless of treatment received, the operator's estimate of probable length of life was used.

Interest on the average investment was considered a cost because the funds tied up in drying equipment could be invested elsewhere and bring in an interest return. An interest rate of five per cent was used. The average investment in drying equipment in each dry-yard was calculated by adding to the cost of the land one half of the original cost of all the other items. This procedure is based on the premise that, for any large group of dry-yards, there will be some now equipment and some very old equipment, and that on the average, the equipment will be worth

The second of the second secon

The state of the s

strong and the contract of the second state of

the section of the se And the second of the second o AND SOURCE AND ADDRESS OF THE PROPERTY OF THE Million St. Committee Comm

The section of the se And the second s and the state of t

about half its original cost. The premise was tested with the data from 80 dry-yards, and it was found that the average value of drying facilities obtained by this method of calculation was \$13.67 per fresh ton of fruit dried. On the same 80 dry-yards the depreciated or "book" value of drying facilities was \$12.67 per fresh ton of fruit dried. Use of the latter figure would have lowered the cost of drying by only five cents per fresh ton.

It should be reiterated here that any costs in connection with items of equipment which were used for more than one kind of fruit were allocated among the different fruits dried. In the majority of cases, the allocation was on the basis of tone of fresh fruit dried. In a few cases, an arbitrary allocation was made based on the operator's description of the respective uses made of the equipment.

A somewhat different classification was necessary on the pear records. It was not possible on these records to separate the labor of repair, maintenance and washing from the regular shed and yard work. A separate item of supervision is shown. This includes only the portion of the manager's salary allocated to the dryyard. Some supervisory labor was paid for by the hour and this cost is shown under shed and yard work. The dehydrator expense item was due to the fact that three of the dry-vards had to finish their fruit in dehydrators because of the late season and the cool weather. General expense for three of the dry-yards was taken from published statements and includes such items as taxes, telephone and telegraph, light and power, office supplies, tractor expense, office expense, director's expenses, and other items of a like nature. To have separated these would have involved a complete audit of the books of these firms. For the fourth yard, general expense was taken as five per cent of labor, material, and equipment cost, plus tractor and county tax costs. The resultant per ton cost fell within the range of general expense costs of the other three dry-yards that had complete accounting systems. Depreciation and interest costs were obtained in the manner previously described.

It was not possible to make much of a separation of cost items in the study of apple drying costs. The eleven firms that cooperated all had somewhat different classifications under which individual expense items were placed. To have made a more detailed breakdown of costs would have required an extensive study of the books of these firms, and a reclassification of many of their expense items. The five cost items used will be described in greater detail in the discussion of tables 13, 14, and 15.

Cost of Drying Apricots

Summary of All Costs. The average cost to dry a ton of apricots in the 58 dry-yards studies in 1942 was \$22.96 (table 3). The dry-yard with the lowest cost reported only \$14.70 as the total cost per fresh ton dried while the highest cost yard reported \$55.86. Much of this difference was due to variations in labor costs which ranged from \$11.70 to \$39.54. Some operators made a practice of sorting their fruit over very carefully before turning it over to the packer. Since family labor was charged as a cost in this study, those operators who devoted considerable time to sorting and upgrading their fruit had higher than average costs even though members of the family did the work. It was not possible in this study to make a separation of the labor cost of this farm sorting of the dried product, but it is known that this work contributed to some of these higher costs.

The range in material costs is due to the fact that some dry-yards purchased no repair material or knives, leaving only sulfur and cards as material expense items.

The second secon

Amia subseque

to the state of th

TABLE 3

Apricots: Summary of Dry-yard Costs per Fresh Ton and per Dried Hundredweight, Fifty-eight Dry-yards, California 1942

| | | r fresh ton | Cost per dried | d hundredweigh |
|--|----------|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| Cost items | Weighted | Range | Weighted | Range |
| | average | | average | |
| | | Dol. | lars | |
| Labor: | | | | |
| Maintenance and repair | 0.66 | | 0.18 | |
| Washing trays and boxes | 0.78 | | 0.21 | |
| Cutting | 8.90 | | 2.42 | |
| Shed, yard and supervision | 7 - 42 | | 2.02 | |
| Total labor | 17.76 | 11.70-39.54 | 4.83 | 3.09 - 12.92 |
| Material: | | | | |
| Repair material | 0.42 | | 0.11 | |
| Sulfur | 0.36 | | 0.10 | |
| Cards, knives, etc. | 0,14 | | 0.04 | |
| Total material | 0.92 | 0.09 - 1.77 | 0.25 | 0.02 - 0.49 |
| Other cash costs: | | | | |
| Equipment | 0.15 | | 0.04 | |
| Taxes | 0.21 | | 0.06 | |
| Compensation insurance | 0.36 | | 0.10 | |
| Fire insurance | 0.21 | | 0.06 | |
| General expense * | 0.74 | | 0.20 | |
| Total other cash costs | 1.67 | 1.02 - 4.54 | 0.46 | 0.28 - 1.48 |
| Depreciation Interest on investment at | 1.62 | 0.20 - 8.90 | 0.44 | 0.05 - 2.34 |
| 5 per cent | 0.99 | 0.16 - 4.16 | 0.27 | 0.04 - 1.23 |
| Total all costs | 22,96 | 14.7053.86 | 6.25 | 4.05 -17.59 |

Fresh weight, tons 3,914.95
Dried weight, hundredweight 14,396.54
Ratio, fresh to dried weight 5.44

^{*} Calculated as being 5 per cent of the labor, material, and equipment cost except for one record for which complete cost accounts were kept.

| 4 1 | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------------|------------|-----------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | 200 American | | 4 10 10 10 | |
| | | * / | | |
| A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH | | | | |
| | | La Company | | 711-7 |
| and the second of the second o | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | 1.1 |
| | | | | |
| | 1.1 | | | 11) 17 11 |
| L. marrier (Contract of Contract of | May | 1 | | |
| and the same of th | | | | 100,000 |
| | | 11 -1 -1 | | / |
| | • | | | |
| | | | | |
| | 5 | 1 mm | | |
| L | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | - 10. |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | - | |
| | | | | |
| | · | -71 - 71 | | |
| 100 | 4 . 3 | | | |
| | | | | |
| | 1, .) 14 | and the same of | | |
| 100 | 4 . 3 | | | |
| | 1, .) 14 | | | |

The range in other cash costs is due in part to the range in labor costs since general expense is a percentage of this item. Compensation insurance also bears a relationship to labor costs and tends to vary with it.

The lowest depreciation and interest costs were reported for the same dry-yard. This operator dried over 300 tons of fruit with a minimum investment in facilities. The highest depreciation cost was recorded on a yard that dried a small tonnage of fruit. The operator had a considerable sum invested in drying facilities which he felt should be depreciated over a fairly short period of time. The result was a high depreciation charge per ton. The high interest charge of \$4.16 per ton was on a dry-yard in Alameda County that had a particularly heavy investment in dry-yard per ton of fruit dried plus a large investment in drying facilities. Only a small tonnage of fruit was dried.

Nearly five and a half pounds of fresh apricots were required for every pound of dried fruit produced, the ratio of fresh to dried weight averaging 5.44 (table 3). The average cost per dried hundrodweight was \$6.25, and the range was from \$4.05 to \$17.59.

Total Cost per Fresh Ton. -- Of the 58 dry-yards, 41 had total costs per fresh ton of less than \$25.00 (table 4). These yards dried 80 per cent of the apricots included in this study. The yards that had the lowest total costs also had the lowest labor and the lowest "all other" costs. As total cost per ton increased, both labor cost and all the other costs showed increases.

Labor Cost per Fresh Ton. -- When the dry-yards were sorted with respect to their labor costs per fresh ton of fruit dried, 44 yards had labor costs of less than \$20,00 per fresh ton (table 5). These yards dried 85 per cent of the apricots covered by this survey. Costs other than labor increased with labor costs although not in the same proportion.

Income from Apricot Pits. -- The apricot grower who elects to dry all or part of his crop has some income from the sale of fits. Anyone interested in making comparisons among prices of fresh, canned, and dried apricots, should consider this fact In the dry-yards studies, there was one ton of fits for every 19.17 tons of fresh fruit dried. The average value of the pits was \$15.33 per ton, which was equal to \$0.80 per ton of fresh fruit and \$0.22 per hundredweight dried.

Cost of Drying by Areas. The total cost of drying a ton of fresh apricots varied from \$21.08 in Stanislaus County to \$26.62 in Alameda County. This difference, while large, was not statistically significant because of the wide variation in costs within each of the areas studied. A difference as great or greater than this could have easily occurred due to factors other than the area in which the dry-yards were located. 3/ Similar results were secured when costs of drying apricots in the various areas were related to a dried weight basis. It should be added that comparisons of apricot drying costs among areas were limited to three counties from

^{3/} Analysis of variance was used to test the statistical significance of the various differences cited in this paper. While it cannot be claimed that the assumptions underlying this technique are strictly fulfilled by the data, it was felt that some objective test of significance of differences should be employed. Otherwise, the reader would be led to endow each numerical difference with a significance it may not possess. In all comparisons mentioned in this paper, the 5 per cent point was used as the level of significance.

tar the same of th 775 - 112 - . . .

TABLE 4

Apricots: Distribution of Fifty-eight Dry-yards with Respect to Their Total Drying Costs per Fresh Ton of Fruit Dried, Selected Areas, California, 1942

| Total cost per fresh ton | Dry-yards | Fresh weight of apricots dried | Weig Labor | hted average All other | All costs |
|--|-------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| Dollars | Number | Tons | | Dollars | |
| 14 to 20 20 to 25 25 to 30 30 to 35 35 to 54 | 20 21 8 6 3 | 991.01 2,139.58 441.11 278.43 64.82 | 14.77 17.42 20.68 24.22 27.57 | 3.10 5.29 6.42 8.21 12.99 | 17.87 22.71 27.10 32.43 40.56 |
| All dry- yards | 58 | 3,914.95 | 17.76 | 5.20 | 22.96 |

TABLE 5

Apricots: Distribution of Fifty-eight Dry-yards with Respect to Their Labor Costs per Fresh Ton of Fruit Dried, Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| Labor cost | | Fresh weight | | ted average of | |
|--|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| fresh ton | Dry-yards | of apricots dried | Labor | All other costs | All costs |
| Dollars | Number | Tons | | Dollars | |
| 11 to 14 14 to 17 17 to 20 20 to 23 23 to 26 26 to 40 | 9 18 17 6 5 | 233.86 1,076.78 2,021.39 179.18 343.57 70.17 | 12.93 15.50 17.71 21.45 23.91 29.93 | 3.75 3.73 5.57 7.37 7.05 7.22 | 16.68 19.23 23.28 28.82 30.96 37.15 |
| All dry- yards | 58 | 3,914.95 | 17.76 | 5.20 | 22.96 |

| | | | The second second second second | The state of the s | |
|-------|-----|------------------|--|--|-------|
| | | | (%) | | |
| Treat | 3/1 | \$1.00 \$1.00 | | | 1,111 |
| LA.E. | 14. | | 100.0 | | |
| 1.8 | | 70.71 | September 1985 and 19 | | |

to another the district to a contract to a c The second secon

| 4000 | | 1 N P | The same of the sa | |
|------|--|--|--|---|
| | and the second second second | Lag by the same of | many may be a | - |
| | | and the state of t | 1 1 10 10 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | |
| | and the second second | | A | |
| | - The same of the | and the state of the state of the state of the | | 4 10 |
| | | Control of the second | | |
| | | 798 | | 7 |
| | | | | 20 4 |
| | | 7 4 A | | to the second of |
| | | 1. 7.07.4 | | |
| | | 1.111. 12 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | માં માં માર્ગ કરવાનો | | |
| | | 11.14.1 | | |
| | | A P | | 1 |
| | | - 31, 311 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | and a | | |
| | | 40,000 | | |
| | | | | |
| | 1 0 1 | 4 1 57 | | |
| | 1. 1 | | | |
| | 1 | | are to the same | |
| | 144 | The same of February and with the | | the second second |
| | | The second secon | | |
| | the same of the sa | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | To a part of |
| | 4 | | the same and the same | 6.0 |
| | | | THE R. LEWIS CO., LANSING P. | |
| | | The second of th | | |
| | | A DR | | |
| | and the second second | 4 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

which the largest number of records was obtained, namely, Santa Clara, Solano, and Stanislaus counties.

Cost of Drying Freestone Peaches

Summary of All Costs. -- The average cost of drying a ton of freestone peaches in the 40 dry-yards studies in 1942 was \$13.21 (table 6). Cost per fresh ton ranged from a low of \$7.17 to a high of \$17.74. Labor was the most important item of cost, representing over 83 per cent of the total. The range in material costs was extremely great. The low-cost yard spent only a few dollars for repair material and burned a minimum amount of sulfur. When questioned concerning the small amount of sulfur used, the operator of this yard stated that his sulfur houses were large enough so that all fruit could be held in them overnight, and he followed the practice of burning a very small amount of sulfur and leaving the fruit exposed for a long period. The yard with the highest material cost per fresh ton used paper tray liners. The cost of this paper was classified as a material cost.

The range in depreciation costs was rather wide. The lowest cost dry-yard is the same one mentioned in the discussion of apricot drying costs. The yard that had a depreciation cost of \$4.45 per fresh ton used a very short period in which to depreciate equipment, particularly trays. The writer visited the yard, and from the treatment some of the trays had received, the short period seemed justified. This yard was one that had no expense for repair material.

Total Cost per Fresh Ton. -- Twenty-five of the dry-yards, representing 51 per cent of the freestone peaches included in this study, had total costs per fresh ton of less than \$13.00 (table 7). The three dry-yards that fell in the highest grouping (\$16.00 to \$19.00 per ton) did so because of their costs other than labor. Labor costs per ton on these yards averaged a little below the labor costs in the next lower group.

Labor Cost per Fresh Ton. -- Over half of the dry-yards had labor costs per fresh ton in the one group -- \$9.00 to \$11.00 (table 8). These yards dried 62 per cent of the freestone peaches in the study. All other costs did not vary in the same proportion as did labor costs.

Income from Peach Pits. -- Peach pits have little commercial value. A few operators reported sales for use as fuel. Some operators used the pits as fuel in their own homes, and the others disposed of them in various ways. The income from them can be disregarded under present price relationships.

Cost of Drying by Areas. -- The ll records from Kings, Tulare, and Freeno counties were grouped together and referred to as the records from the "Fresno Area." The 26 records from Stanislaus County were considered as representing a second area, and the other three records were excluded on the basis of constituting too small a sample to represent their respective areas. Differences in total costs per fresh ton between the Stanislaus County records and those taken in the Fresno Area were not found to be statistically significant. Similar results were secured when costs were expressed on a per dried hundredweight basis.

Cost of Drying Clingstone Peaches

Summary of All Costs.-- The average cost to dry a ton of clingstone peaches in the 14 dry-yards studied in 1942 was \$17.43. The range in costs was rather narrow,

Hy profession or the Calebra and the

्राच्या क्षेत्रका क् स्थितिक क्षेत्रका क

en de la companya de

The state of the s per year or her grager or any and the same

TABLE 6

Freestone Peaches: Summary of Dry-yard Costs per Fresh Ton and per Dried Hundrodweight, Forty Dry-yards, Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| | | fresh ton | | d hundredweight |
|---------------------------|----------|-------------|----------|-----------------|
| Cost items | Weighted | Range | Weighted | Range |
| | average | | average | |
| | | Dolla | ars | |
| Labor: | | | | |
| Maintenance and repair | 0.43 | | 0.14 | |
| Washing trays and boxes | 0.55 | | 0.18 | |
| Cutting | 4.24 | • | 1.42 | |
| Shed, yard, and | | | | |
| supervision | 4.59 | | 1.54 | |
| Total labor | 9.81 | 5.62 -12.00 | 3.28 | 1.80 - 4.30 |
| Material: | | | | |
| Repair material | 0.26 | | 0.09 | |
| Sulfur | 0.29 | | 0.10 | |
| Cards, knives, etc. | 0.07 | | 0.02 | |
| Total material | 0.62 | 0.03 - 2.38 | 0.21 | 0.01 - 0.83 |
| Other cash costs: | | | | |
| Equipment | 0.07 | | 0.03 | |
| Taxes | 0.11 | | 0.04 | |
| Compensation insurance | 0.22 | | 0.07 | |
| Fire insurance | 0.11 | | 0.03 | |
| General expense * | 0.47 | | 0.16 | |
| Total other cash costs | 0.98 | 0.40 - 1.65 | 0.33 | 0.13 - 0.60 |
| Depreciation | 1.26 | 0.20 - 4.45 | 0.42 | 0.06 - 1.72 |
| Interest on investment at | | | | |
| 5 per cent | 0.54 | 0.16 - 1.33 | 0.18 | 0.05 - 0.40 |
| Total all costs | 13.21 | 7.17 -17.74 | 4.42 | 2.30 - 5.88 |

Fresh weight, tons 8,196,84
Dried weight, hundredweight 24,511.16
Ratio, fresh to dried weight 6.69

^{*} Calculated as being 5 per cent of the labor, material, and equipment cost except for one record for which complete cost accounts were kept.

....

TABLE 7

Freestone Peaches: Distribution of Forty Dry-yards with Respect to Their Total Drying Costs per Fresh Ton of Fruit Dried, Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| Total cost | | Fresh weight | Weighted | average cost pe | r ton |
|---|--------------------|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| per fresh ton | Dry-yards | of freestone peaches, dried | Labor | All other costs | All costs |
| Dollars | Number | Tons | | Dollars | |
| 7 to 10 10 to 13 13 to 16 16 to 19 | 5 20 12 3 | 776.55 3,403.75 2,818.47 1.198.07 | 7.04 9.40 10.74 10.55 | 1.70. 2.62. 3.71. 6.04. | 8.74 12.02 14.45 16.59 |
| All dry- yards | 40 | 8,196.84 | 9.81 | 3.40 | 13.21 |

TABLE 8

Freestone Peaches: Distribution of Forty Dry-yards with Respect to Their Labor Costs per Fresh Ton of Fruit Dried, Scleeted Areas, California, 1942.

| Labor cost | | Fresh weight | | average cost | |
|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|--------------|-----------|
| per | Dry-yards | of freestone | Labor | All other | All costs |
| fresh ton | | peaches, dried | | costs | |
| Dollars | Number | Tons | | Dollars | |
| 5 to 7 | 4 | 416.25 | 6.17 | 2.33 | 8.50 |
| 7 to 9 | 8 | 1,226.96 | 8.28 | 2.82 | 11.10 |
| 9 to 11 | 22 | 5,049.41 | 9.97 | 3.76 | 13.73 |
| 11 to 13 | 6 | 1,504.22 | 11.50 | 3.04 | 14.54 |
| All dry- yards | 40 | 8,196.84 | 9.81 | 3.40 | 13.21 |

7 1 2

| 1 |
|------------|
| + 14 · 3 · |

1 1 1 2

Secretary of the second of the

| | | | w/ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | and a section of the section of |
|--------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------|
| 21998 No 1924 - 1 | The state of the state of | c | | |
| 4. 42 | | | | T- 1200 1 |
| 91 00 000111 00000 | 1000 | | 1 | 14 |
| | | | A. 1.1 | |
| 1 | | | | 47 12 |
| L. Wid | | | | |
| | 4.1 | | | · |

the low-cost yards averaging \$15.51 and the high-cost yard \$19.40 per fresh ton (table 9). The higher cost of cutting the clingstone peaches largely accounts for the difference in cost between this fruit and the freestone varieties.

Total Cost per Fresh Ton. -- Five of the 14 dry-yards had average costs within the interval \$17.00 to \$18.00 (table 10). Variation in labor cost per fresh ton was largely responsible for the variation in total costs inasmuch as the labor item represented about 83 per cent of the total cost.

Labor Cost per Fresh Ton .-- A tabulation of the 14 dry-yards arranged by groups on the basis of their labor cost per fresh ton is presented in table 11.

Cost of Drying Bartlett Pears

Records of pear-drying costs were obtained from three dry-yards in Lake County and from one dry-yard in Alameda County. The yards in Lake County were owned and operated by three farmers' cooperative organizations and served as a means of utilizing members' fruit that was unsatisfactory for shipping or for sale to canneries. The yard in Alameda County was owned by a commercial drier who bought pears from Santa Clara County and dried them for his own account.

The average drying cost in these four dry-yards during the 1942 season was \$25.30 per ton of fresh pears (table 12). The lowest cost yard reported a cost of \$21.98 while the highest cost yard reported \$31.80 per fresh ton. The ratio of fresh weight to dried weight was 5.20, resulting in an average cost per dried hundredweight of \$6.57. Labor was the biggest item of expense, accounting for slightly more than seventy per cent of the total cost.

Cost of Drying Apples

Apples are dried by means of artificial heat in contrast to the sun-drying methods used for apricots, peaches, and pears. This fact has tended to concentrate the drying of apples within the control of a relatively few large commercial apple driers. Records of apple-drying costs were obtained from 11 operators who produced a total of 2,115 tons of dried apples. The data used in this study were supplied from the records of those eleven operators. No attempt was made by the author to audit the books of these firms. Because of the lack of uniformity in the accounting systems employed by these firms, it was possible to separate costs into only five different enterpries.

The average cost of drying Gravenstein Apples was \$12.64 per fresh ton (table 13). For every ton of dried apples, 8.23 tons of fresh apples were required, resulting in an average cost per dried ton of \$103.96. This variety was dried only in the Sobastopol area.

Labor was the most important single item of cost. This item includes all inited labor plus a charge for the operators' own time in those driers where a portion of the work was done by him. Supplies include sulfur, sodium sulfite, salt, box shook, paper, nails, sacks, and unclassified supply items. The wide range in this cost item, \$0.95 to \$14.16 por dried ton, is due largely to the fact that some of the operators packed apples in boxes, while others used the less expensive method of sadeing them.

And the second s

· erin - i

· ket - stage for a

The state of the s

TABLE 9

Clingstone Peaches: Summary of Dry-yard Costs per Fresh Ton and per Dried Hundredweight, Fourteen Dry-yards, Stanislaus County, California, 1942.

| Cost items | Weighted | fresh ton Co | Weighted average | Range |
|-----------------------------|----------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| | avorago | Dolla | | |
| abor: | | | | |
| Maintenance and repair | 0.25 | | 0.09 | |
| Washing trays and boxes | 0.40 | | 0.15 | |
| Cutting | 9.04 | | 3.29 | |
| Shed, yard, and supervision | 4.80 | | 1.75 | |
| Total labor | 14.49 | 12.28-16.19 | 5,28 | 3.85 - 6.45 |
| aterial: | | | | |
| Repair material | 0.11 | | 0.04 | |
| Sulfur | 0.37 | | 0.13 | |
| Cards, knives, etc. | * | | * | |
| | 0.48 | 0.15- 0.89 | 0.17 | 0.04 - 0.36 |
| ther cash costs: | | | | |
| Equipment | 0.10 | | 0.04 | |
| Taxes | 0.07 | | 0.03 | |
| Compensation insurance | 0.34 | | 0.13 | |
| Fire insurance | 0.03 | | 0.01 | |
| General expense | 0.76 | | 0.27 | |
| Total other cash costs | 1.30 | 1.02- 1.92 | 0.48 | 0.29 - 0.72 |
| epreciation | 0.82 | 0.34- 1.54 | 0.30 | 0.13 - 0.58 |
| nterest on investment at | | | | |
| 5 per cent | 0.34 | 0.23- 0.71 | 0.12 | 0.08 - 0.26 |
| Total all costs | 17.43 | 15.51-19.40 | 6.35 | 4.45 - 7.89 |
| Total all costs | 11040 | 10.01-19.40 | 0.00 | 7.70 - 7.09 |

^{*} Less than \$0.005

[/] Calculated as being 5 per cent of the labor, material, and equipment cost.

| A 10 10 7.11 | | 100 | 1 4 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 | |
|--------------|-----|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | |
| | 11. | | | |
|)—idie is | | ** | | <u>.</u> |
| F | | ~ , - ; . | | e to grow the grant |
| | | | , | ្រុងស្រុក មិនប្រការ មិនប្រការ ក៏ទូលការ ពិភពលោក ការ សុខ ពី |
| | | | | ista sinaka kadaban bada kan kadaban 1996 Santan bada sinaka |
| | 0.7 | | 5.8 | ofine laws solve wile? 10 Junio sgrid 10 FB - Palwasside John Sol |
| | | I a land | 13.1 | ritopo (filo de la filo) |
| | | The second depart, months | 1, 97°, 7° | in a little of the second of t |
| | | | and a second distribution of | 3702 - 4.75 - 4.75 |

300, and tend to the state of t

TABLE 10

Clingstone Peaches: Distribution of Fourteen Dry-yards with Respect to Their Total Drying Costs per Fresh Ton of Fruit Dried, Stanislaus County, California, 1942

| Total cost | | Fresh weight of | Weighte | ed average cos | t per ton |
|--|-----------------------|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| per fresh ton | Dry-yards | clingstone peaches dried | Labor | All other costs | All costs |
| Dollars | Number | Tons | | Dollars | |
| 15 to 16 16 to 17 17 to 18 18 to 19 19 to 20 | 2 3 5 2 2 | 31.78 451.76 325.57 464.88 102.74 | 13.05 13.68 14.33 15.15 16.03 | 1.20 0.77 1.27 1.37 1.52 | 15.54 16.28 17.45 18.23 19.35 |
| All dry- yards | 14 | 1,376.73 | 14.49 | 1.16 | 17.43 |

TABLE 11

Clingstone Peaches: Distribution of Fourteen Dry-yards with Respect to Their Labor Costs per Fresh Ton of Fruit Dried, Stanislaus County, California, 1942.

| Labor cost | | Fresh weight of | Weight | ed average cost | |
|--|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| per fresh ton | Dry-yards | clingstone peaches dried | Labor | All other costs | All costs |
| Dollars | Number | Tons | | Dollars | |
| 12 to 13 13 to 14 14 to 15 15 to 17 | 2 4 4 4 | 73.32 494.35 288.48 520.58 | 12.83 13.79 14.48 15.40 | 1.24 0.82 1.63 1.20 | 16.39 16.36 18.00 18.27 |
| All dry- yards | 14 | 1,376.73 | 14.49 | 1.16 | 17.43 |

-- -- --

| | | | 12.00.0212 | .)= • 💒 | * |
|------|------|-----|------------|----------|--|
| | | | | | |
| | -1. | 7.4 | | | 14 A. 41 14 A. 41 |
| | | | 1 | | i vi |
| | 1111 | | | | 4. 10 % |
| 1100 | = 14 | | 12 7 | 1 | 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1 |

-0.00

The material states of the sta

| | | | 40.04 | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|--|
| 211 | | | er ratio | Contract (1) | 200 |
| The second of th | | | The real of a comparate control production when the control of the | * | And the second of the second o |
| 100 | 17. | | | | SERF IN |
| | | ana i | and the second | Ð | 1981 B. M. C. |
| | * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * | ore secure that present the con- | The state of the s | 18 4 09 WHILE THE THE THE | Miles In |
| Vien. | 10%, 1 | 65. | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | M | |
| 77 | Terro simelitation in a | in his entitle of the other than the same | of algebra and a deligible talk in the case was easily as their | de Indexion-stating - m A . | I france or agest, our rest in |

TABLE 12

Pears: Summary of Dry-yard Costs per Fresh Ton and per Dried Hundredweight, Four Dry-yards, California, 1942.

| Cost items | Weighted | | Weighted | Range |
|------------------------|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|
| | | Do | llars | |
| abor: | | | | |
| Cutting | 8.87 | | 2.30 | |
| Shed and yard | 8.34 | | 2.17 | |
| Supervision - | 0.94 | | 0.24 | |
| Total labor | 18.15 | 13.64-23.32 | 4.71 | 3.25 - 5.85 |
| ther cash costs: | | İ | | |
| Sulfur | 0.48 | | 0.12 | |
| Repair material | 0.34 | | 0.09 | |
| Other material | 0.27 | | 0.07 | |
| Tray rent | 0.06 | | 0.01 | |
| Dehydrator expense | 0.37 | 1 | 0.10 | |
| Insurance | 0.40 | | 0.11 | |
| General expense | 0.78 | | 0.20 | |
| Total other cash costs | 2.70 | 1.70- 4.31 | 0.70 | 0.40 - 1.09 |
| verhead costs: | | | | |
| Depreciation | 3.31 | 2.74- 4.29 | 0.86 | 0.66 - 1.31 |
| Interest on investment | 1.14 | 0.84- 2.39 | 0.30 | 0.20 - 0.57 |
| Total overhead costs | 4.45 | 3.58- 5.71 | 1.16 | 0.86 - 1.75 |
| Total all costs | 25.30 | 21.98-31.80 | 6.57 | 5.23 - 8.23 |

A THE RESERVE TO THE RESERVE T

| | | | | arms a comment of the state of the Access of the |
|--|-------|-------|-----|--|
| | | | | · · |
| | ter . | | | 1.4 |
| | | | | |
| The state of the s | | -4-14 | | * |
| when the state of | | | | |
| | | | | 1 12 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| · James | | | | |
| | | 11.00 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | * | | | 914 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | the state of |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | 31 1 1 31 |
| | | | | All the second second |
| Company and Company of the Company o | | | | and the are red. |
| ~ | | | | as the street of the street |
| | | | | |
| 1 | | | i . | and the second of the |
| Class will a series | | | | artis to contact to the first |
| | | | | |
| 381,11 - 31.4 | | 11 | | 11000 Table 1 |
| or for gradity a bay's tras as were | | | | |
| THE WAR STATE | | | | the state of the |
| - Shall Wild Thought for and | | | | rayon a management of the stranger of the stra |
| | | | | |
| | | . 1 | | 2500 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 |
| | | | | and the second of the second |
| | | | | |
| | | - 1 - | | Media di California di Nella, |
| The state of the s | | | | |
| | | | | |

TABLE 13

Gravenstein Apples: Summary of Drying Costs per Fresh Ton and per Dried Ton, Six Driers, Sebastopol Area, California, 1942.

| | Cost per | fresh ton | Cost pe | r dried ton |
|----------------------------------|----------|-------------|----------|--------------|
| Cost items | Weighted | Range | Weighted | Range |
| | average | | average | |
| | | Dol | lars | |
| Labor | 8,66 | 7.52-11.25 | 71.25 | 52.11-87.09 |
| Supplies | 1.21 | 0.11- 1.71 | 9.97 | 0.95-14.16 |
| Fuel, electricity, and water | 0.99 | 0.83- 1.29 | 8,16 | 6.65-11.93 |
| General expense | 0.49 | 0.13- 0.67 | 4.06 | 0.95- 4.66 |
| Rent, interest, and depreciation | 1.29 | 0.42- 3.59 | 10.52 | 2,86-31.50 |
| Total all costs | 12.64 | 11.17-16.17 | 103.96 | 77.41-141.83 |
| Fresh weight, tons | 4,022.0 | | | |
| Ratio, fresh to dried weight | 8.: | 23 | | |

LI LINE

and the introduction of the region of the re

| | | ************************************** | pulsa inisa i mm |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| V.Drestor | 36. (| 1 | |
| | manga ngangga ng 1 1 man man ng 1 | \$ 10 mm | 1974 CT \$20 1, 150 1974 CT \$20 1, 150 1975 CT \$12 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 |

Fuel, electricity, and water were costs common to all of the driers. Some of them kept separate records of those items, but a few driers did not, so it was necessary to combine the three items into the one cost cateory.

General expense includes taxes, insurance, repair, storage, inspection, telephone, office supplies, and the other miscellaneous costs connected with the operation of the drier. Because all of the operators kept complete records, it was not necessary to approximate the general expense as was the case for the apricot and peach records.

Five of the six operators who dried Gravenstein apples rented their driers. Four paid rents based on the green tonnage of apples dried. The other paid a flat sum as rent for the entire season. Depreciation on the owner-operated drier was figured at the same rate as the operator used on his income tax return.

Two interest items were calculated. Interest on the average investment at the rate of 5 per cent was figured as a cost on all of the owner-operated driers. Interest on working capital was figured as a cost for all the driers in the study. The assumption was made that each operator would need working capital equal to one half of his expenses other than depreciation and interest and that this sum would be needed for four months. An annual interest rate of 6 per cent was used. This rate was paid by some of the operators who needed bank oredit.

Only four of the six cooperating driers in the Sebastopol area dried late apples (table 14). The average cost per fresh ton was \$12.35 and the average per dried ton \$82.46. The low cost per dry ton was due to the low ratio of fresh to dried weight of 6.67 which was reported by these four driers. This low ratio was due to the quality of the fruit delivered to the driers and would not prevail under ordinary conditions.

Costs per fresh ton averaged somewhat higher in the Watsonville area (table 15). The important differences were in connection with the items of supplies and general expense. Four of the five driers in this area packed out their fruit in wooden boxes for delivery to the United States Army and accordingly had the high costs associated with this type of pack. This accounts primarily for the larger supplies cost. The higher general expense item may be attributed in part to the more complete accounting systems employed by the Watsonville area firms. They were larger, and most of them employed full-time bookkeepers and were thus in a position to record properly all charges against the drier operation. Some of the smaller firms in the Sebastopol area did not have regularly employed bookkeepers, and their records, as a consequence, were not as complete.

Six of the eleven operators interviewed rented the driers that they operated. Excluding one drier that was rented on a seasonal basis, the average rental charge was \$7.86 per ton of dried apples. This compares with average interest on investment and depreciation charges totaling \$6.43 for the five owner-operated driers (table 16). The data on taxes and repairs on buildings and equipment were not given in sufficient detail to permit their inclusion, but it seems highly probable that these two expense items would equal or exceed the \$1.43 difference shown in table 16.

Credit for Apple By-products. -- In the drying of arples, certain products of value other than the dried apple result. The cores, peelings, and small apples, can be used in making vinegar. In some cases, the small peices of dried apple, or "screenings," as they are called in the industry, can be utilized.

There is some difference of opinion in the industry as to the proper accounting procedure to be followed with regard to the money received from these products.

26 5 10 10 1 1 1 2 4 5

The state of the s

The second secon

One group believes that this income should be credited against the cost of drying and thus serve to lower the cost. The other group believes that any income from these products should revert to the drier, and not serve to reduce the cost. Sound accounting procedure favors the former group.

Data are available from only three driers as to the exact amounts received in 1942 from the sale of these by-products. One firm received the following amounts per ton of dried apples; \$5.73 for cores and peeling; \$3.87 for dier apples; and \$21.84 for screenings and pickouts. This amounted to a total return from these products of \$31.44 per ton of dried apples. This was the only firm that stated that a return had been received from the screenings. Sevoral other firms indicated that their screenings had been condemned as unfit for human consumption by the State Inspector. The other two driers reported that they received \$7.69 and \$7.04 respectively for cores and peelings per ton of dried fruit.

This matter of the value of these by-products should be investigated thoroughly. The value of the screenings in particular suggests that ways be studied for preserving their quality so that they might remain in all possible cases an edible product.

Some Factors Affecting the Cost of Drving Apricots and Peaches

This discussion is limited to apricots and peaches because of the larger number of records obtained of the costs of drying these fruits. The principles brought out here are applicable also to pears and apples.

Ratio of fresh to dried weight. The relation between the fresh weight of the fruit and its dried weight is extremely important to the dry-yard operator. Virtually all of his costs associated with drying bear a direct relation to the tonnage of fresh fruit handled. His income is dependent, however, upon the weight (and the quality) of the dried product.

The differences in drying ratios of either apricots or peaches among the various areas studied in 1942 were not statistically significant. However, there were significant differences among the drying ratios of the different varieties of fruit. The analysis of variance of drying ratios by varieties is reproduced for apricots in table 19 and for peaches in table 20. Of the apricot varieties, only Royal, Elenheim, and Tilton were dried in sufficient tennage to be considered (table 17). For freestone peaches, the differences among the Elberta, Muir and Lovell varieties were tested. The Lovell variety was represented by the largest tennage of the freestone peaches included in this study, and the Muir variety ranked second in importance (table 18). The clingstone peaches studied were not reported separately by varieties.

Average Investment per Ton. -- The average investment per ton of fruit dried has an important bearing on the drying cost per ton through its effect upon both the interest and depreciation charges. However, before examining the investment per ton, it is pertinent to consider the tonnage of fruit dried.

These 81 dry-yards dried a total of 16,333.80 tons of fruit (table 21). Freestone peaches were represented with the largest tonnage, apricots were second in importance with clingstone peaches third. In addition to these three crops, these yards also dried 889.5 tons of prunes, 523 tons of golden bleach raisins, 189.4 tons of pears, and 136.7 tons of nectarines. All weights are the fresh weight of the fruit dried.

The Art of the same of the sam

profession and extension of the contract of the contract of

Add the production of the control of t

Let the property due of the property of the pr

The first transport of the resolution of the Mountain and the person of the polymer of the first transport of the

TABLE 14

Late Apples: Summary of Drying Costs per Fresh Ton and per Dried Ton, Four Driers, Sebastopol Area, California, 1942.

| | Cost per | fresh ton | Cost pe: | r dried ton |
|----------------------------------|----------|-------------|----------|--------------|
| Cost items | Weighted | Range | Weighted | Range |
| | average | | average | |
| | | Dollars | | |
| Labor | 8.64 | 7.51-11.58 | 57.65 | 47.69- 85.13 |
| Supplies | 1.26 | 0.14- 1.60 | 8.45 | 0.95- 10.19 |
| Fuel, electricity, and water | 1.01 | 0.96- 1.30 | 6.73 | 6.09- 8.95 |
| General expense | 0.63 | 0.25- 1.06 | 4.16 | 1.75- 7.27 |
| Rent, interest, and depreciation | 0.82 | 0.42- 1.31 | 5.49 | 2.61- 11.18 |
| Total all costs | 12.36 | 11.17-15.37 | 82.48 | 70.86-118.95 |
| Fresh weight, tons | 2,271 | | | |
| Dried weight, tons | 340 | | | |
| Ratio, fresh to dried weight | 6. | .67 | | |

TABLE 15

Late Apples: Summary of Drying Costs per Fresh Ton and per Dried Ton, Five Driers, Watsonville Area, California, 1942.

| | Cost per | fresh ton | Cost p | er dried ton |
|----------------------------------|----------|-------------|----------|---------------|
| Cost items | Weighted | Range | Weighted | Range |
| | average | | average | |
| | | Dolla | rs | |
| Labor | 8.79 | 6.21-12.73 | 71.11 | 55.69- 93.49 |
| Supplies | 2.03 | 1.59- 2.83 | 16.43 | 11.59- 22.05 |
| Fuel, electricity, and water | 0.70 | 0.52- 1.01 | 5.61 | 4.56- 7.44 |
| General expense | 1.55 | 1.02- 1.79 | 12.54 | 7.53- 16.16 |
| Rent, interest, and depreciation | 1.11 | 0.97- 1.49 | 8.99 | 7.52- 10.84 |
| Total all costs | 14.18 | 11.47-17.37 | 114.68 | 102.89-127.57 |
| Fresh weight, tons | 10,39 | 9.12 | d | |
| Dried weight, tons | 1,28 | 5.60 | | |
| Ratio, fresh to dried weight | | 8.09 | | |

THE SECOND STREET COMES TO SEE A SECOND SECO

| , | |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| 9 - 09 | The state of the s |
| | A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR |
| | % |
| New York Control of the Control of t | Control of |
| di se la la companya de la companya | |
| The second of th | |
| | The state of the s |
| a participate the second secon | 11112 |
| | quark (- 4) |
| and the second s | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| the state of the s | |
| | The state of the s |
| | |
| Approximate the first term of the contract of | The second secon |
| | |
| | |
| ** | |
| the second of th | annunger Maria prijak dan er fan er en de de en er e |
| | |
| 7214 | 2012/2011/201 |
| and presented | 2 192 (2 |
| and produce | 12 12 12 |
| and produce | |
| and present them. | 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 |
| | All sec |
| | Set sale |
| | The Control of the Co |
| | Set sale |
| | Part State of the |
| | Part State of the |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 75 gas 27 |
| | F 3 - 2 - 42 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 |
| | 75 gas 27 |
| | F 3 3 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 |
| | F 3 3 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 |
| | |
| | |
| | |

TABLE 16

Comparison of Rental Charges with Depreciation and Interest on Investment 11 Selected Apple Driers, Sebastopol and Watsonville Areas, California, 1942.

| Drier | Rent per dried ton | Depreciation and interest per dried ton |
|------------------|--------------------------|---|
| | 5011 | bet difed con |
| Number 1 | \$ 7.00 | |
| Number 2 | 7.50 | |
| Number 3 | 8.00 | |
| Number 4 | 8.00 | |
| Number 5 | 10.00 | |
| Number 6 | 30.10* | |
| Number 7 | | \$ 2.11 |
| Number 8 | | 6.32 |
| Number 9 | | 6.51 |
| Number 10 | | 8.71 |
| Number 11 | | 9.82 |
| Weighted average | \$ 7.86/ | \$ 6.43 |

^{*} Drier rented on a seasonal basis. Smaller tonnage dried than was anticipated.

A verage does not include drier Number 6.

. . .

The second section of the section

| The same of the second state of the second s | to the second contraction and despite a second despite the great to the property and application of the second sec | |
|--|--|--------------------------------|
| prit 10.4% * recent i br | | to the |
| | | |
| 187.40 D | \$16.5 | of the second of the second of |

and the second second to the second s

TABLE 17

Tonnage of Apricots Dried, by Varieties, Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| | | | | | pricots dried | |
|--|--|--------|----------------------|----------|------------------------------|--|
| A rea | Blenheim | Royal | Tilton | Moorpark | Variety not segregated | All varieties |
| Contra Costa Solano Santa Clara Stanislaus San Benito Alameda | 1,018.20 553.48 269.25 175.41 268.17 | 598.66 | 184.00 229.78 | 12.76 | 359.45 5.04 240.75 | 1,561.65 598.66 566.24 504.07 416.16 268.17 |
| All areas | 2,284.51 | 598.66 | 413.78 | 12.76 | 605.24 | 3,914.95 |

TABLE 18

Tonnage of Freestone Feaches Dried, by Varieties,
Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| | Fresh tons of peaches dried | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Area | Lovell | Muir | Elberta | Hale | Variety not segregated | All varieties | |
| Stanislaus Fresno Brentwood-Winters | 2,851.92 321.39 133.42 | 1,230.97 314.10 716.78 | 374.35 774.61 85.40 | 50.18 | 542.22 332.10 252.80 | 5,049.64 1,742.20 1,405.00 | |
| All areas | 3,306.73 | 2,261.85 | 1,234.36 | 266.78 | 1,127.12 | 8.196.84 | |

Carlot Law to to the Completion associated by the Completion and the Completion of t

| A in a | DONE CALL | | | , | | 2.46 |
|-------------|-----------|--------|----------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| 31.45 3,1 } | 5 | ~ | 1 . Nu F | | 147 466 4 | por logs |
| 24 1 | No. 4/9 | *** | | | | 50 |
| | | 10 411 | | 2000 | | 15/11 //- |
| 1.0 | -1 | | | 2.79 | | |
| | **** | | | | 71. | 71 |
| 0 0.3 | . ~ | 7.00 | . W. T. | 94. 4 | 11,110,0 | s · //. |

£ .5%

Proc services to the last of the services of t

| T. 19 | 4 1 4 | | TO SEE THE | Control of the Contro | The same of the sa | man to the second secon |
|-------|--------|---------|------------|--|--|--|
| | 1 | 14 44 | 20.377 | 106.46 | water of | \$5.14 . 4 \$5 4 85-37. 4311 (1.7) |
| | 11.457 | 151.900 | 51 | in district and | 67.12.,0 | × 30 11. |

TABLE 19

Analysis of Variance of Drying Ratios of Apricots, by Variaties, California, 1942.

| Variety | Number of records* | Average drying ratio | Variance | Degrees of freedom | Variance | Variance ratio, F. | 5 per cent table value of F. |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Royal Blenheim Tilton | 12 38 | 5.38 5.49 6.35 | Among varieties Within varieties | | 3.55 0.31 | 11.65 | 3.16 |
| All variaties | | 5.63 | Total | 60 | | | |

^{*} Some dry-yards dried more than one variety.

TABLE 20

Analysis of Variance of Drying Ratios of Freestone Peaches, by Varieties, California, 1942.

| Variety | Number of records* | Average drying ratio | Variance analysis | Degrees of freedom | Variance | Variance ratio, F. | 5 per cent table value of F. |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Elberta Muir Lovell | 17 21 · 30 | 7.06 7.01 6.44 | Among varieties Within varieties | 2 65 | 2.91 | 4.07 | 3.14 |
| Total | 68 | 6.77 | Total | 67 | | | |

^{*} Some dry-yards dried more than one variety.

And the first of the second se

| | 1 AA, 1 | 7 A 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | | | ge Anti- |
|--|---------|--|----------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|
| g Born and Area | 7 a | | | | |
| ** | 0.00 | i ya z | | ا المالية | (1) (1) (1) (2) (1) (1) (1) |
| | | | S(*) | | man file gigat muminima magan |
| | g | | | in . | green and |
| | | | | | |
| | - 50 | | | | a promotion of |
| | 3 | 198 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 | and the second | | |
| for the state of t | | | | 93 | Ţ. |
| | 111 | and the state of t | | 4 | |
| And the second of the second o | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | |

TABLE 21

Tonnage of All Fruit Dried, 81 Dry-yards, Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| | | | | Fresh we | ight of f | ruit drie | ed | | |
|--------------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|--------|-----------|--|
| Area | Apricots | Freestone | | Pears | Nectar- | Grapes* | Prunes | Total | |
| | | peaches | peaches | | ines | | + | | |
| | | Tons | | | | | | | |
| Stanislaus | 657.97 | 5,049.64 | 1,416.73 | | | | | 7,124.34 | |
| Contra Costa | 1,561.65 | 1,441.70 | 15.50 | | 136.7 | | | 3,155.55 | |
| Fresno | 28,25 | 1,770.20 | | - | | 523.0 | | 2,321.45 | |
| Solano | 598.66 | 804.30 | | 20.70 | | | 121.5 | 1,545.16 | |
| Santa Clara | 566.24 | | | 25.00 | | | 420.0 | 1,011.24 | |
| San Benito | 416.16 | | | | | | 348.0 | 764.16 | |
| Alameda | 268.17 | | | 143.73 | | | | 411.90 | |
| All areas | 4,097.10 | 9,065.84 | 1,432.23 | 189.43 | 136.7 | 523.0 | 889.5 | 16,333.80 | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

^{*} Grapes for Golden Bleach raisins only. On some farms in Stanislaus County and in the Fresno area, the trays were used in the field for drying grapes.

TABLE 22

Average Investment in Drying Facilities per Fresh Ton of Fruit Dried, 80 Dry-yards*, Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| | | | | Average | investme | nt per fre | sh ton | dried | |
|--------------|-------|---------|--------|---------|----------|------------|--------|-------|-------|
| Area | Land | Cutting | Sulfur | Trays | Boxes | Tracks | Cars | Misc. | Total |
| | | shed | houses | | | | | | |
| | | Dollars | | | | | | | |
| Stanislaus | 1.51 | 0.87 | 0.56 | 3.74 | 0.32 | 0.35 | 0.25 | 0.16 | 7.76 |
| Solano | 1.56 | 2.41/ | 1.22/ | 5.45 | 0.49 | 0.25 | 0.22 | 0.15 | 11.75 |
| Fresno | 1.97 | 1.18 | 0.69 | 8.48 | 0.44 | 0.31 | 0.21 | 0.78 | 14.06 |
| Contra Costa | 1.66 | 4.90 | 2.34 | 5.34 | 0.88 | 1.14 | 0.71 | 0.93 | 17.90 |
| San Benito | 3.28 | 4.27/ | 2.70/ | 8.13 | 0.48 | 0.63 | 0.51 | 0.56 | 20.56 |
| Santa Clara | 6.31 | 12.85 | 1.50 | 8.54 | 0.94 | 0.56 | 0.54 | 0.19 | 31.43 |
| Alameda | 12.26 | 2.65 | 3.77 | 24.53 | 1.13 | 0.47 | 0.60 | 1.49 | 46.90 |
| All areas | 2.26 | 2.46 | 1.18 | 5.91 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.37 | 0.45 | 13.67 |

^{*} Data on investment not comparable for one dry-yard.

[/] Sun-dried prunes only. In some cases, the trays and other equipment were used in connection with the dehydrating of prunes.

[/] In determining the average investment per ton in cutting shed and sulfur house, the total average investment was divided by the tonnage of fruit other than prunes.

2 11

The state of the s

| | • | The same of the sa | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | Or a special state of the state | and the same of th |
| | the state of the s | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 27 1.1 |
| | the program of the same | and the second s | |
| 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1 | 1 | | |
| Company to a set of the set of th | The Street of London Street of Street or Street | tight is continued by the continued of t | the property was in one party. |
| grant and an armed to | The state of the state of the | The state of the s | THE R. LEWIS CO. LANS. |
| and the same of th | | And the second s | |
| The same of the Contract of | a | marks and said the part and the | A 2 A 2 |
| £25234 | . () | and the same of th | |
| | The same of the sa | The state of the s | 40. |
| The same of the sa | AND THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS | the set of | A WAIS III |
| Secretary Co. | Contract to a provide the Contract of the | The state of the s | A Committee of the Comm |
| . at proper | A 81 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 | | |
| planter the same | The second secon | The state of the s | DAT 59.1 |
| 44 CT 15 PR 1 | and the same of the same | 1000 | |
| Charles and the second | C. Tana | and the second s | m d = friend |
| 11.0 | 1 2 1 11 11 | The state of the s | |
| - 4 | | C. A. Carlotte 1 (1974) | er sylvania |
| 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | ment and a contract and a first and | and the second | 1 |
| | | 10.00 | 10 10 10 10 |
| | agine | 40 m | A. Just H. B. |
| | 7 m 94 | 15 | |
| The British Control of the Control o | | and the same of th | 100 C 100 |
| | | TO THE STATE OF TH | |
| | we re | 112 12 12 12 | |
| a the same of the | ATT MAN TO A STATE OF STATE OF | The same and the s | et a filia |
| 1 1 2 2 2 | 1.0 | manager and the file had a file | 4 - 1 |
| | op op | The state of the s | and the second second |
| | · ADMITTA OF THE PARTY OF | The state of the s | AND 1 1 WORLD 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 |
| | make at a second and a second at the second | A second of the party of the pa | 44 to 1 1/1 to 1 |
| A contract of the latest and the lat | and a comment of | Charle agreement PAPCES CAN ARREST CO. Bridge complete of the | LL v |
| 5 - 21 | The same of the sa | the state of the s | A man of the |
| at a self- | The second secon | The state of the s | the second second |
| get a state of the same | the state of the s | · General Control of the Control of | |
| and the second second | | | |
| the state of the s | | 7 1, 100 - 100 | 2. 1. 4. 4. |
| | the state of the s | - white it is a first of the contract of the c | |
| A 11 (4 . 11) | 134 B 1 | and the state of t | |
| | | الله الله الله الله الله الله الله الله | A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR |
| | and the second second | | |
| 5.00 4 | A 1 A 1 A 1 A 1 A 1 A 1 A 1 A 1 A 1 A 1 | There is not easily a well to | |
| and the tree | | | |
| | | | |

A Section

She is a market could be seen as a small of the second sec

| ASI, ASI, ASI, ASI, ASI, ASI, ASI, ASI, | | and the second | Committee of the state of the s | , |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | A CONTRACTOR SERVICES CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACT | person of the second of the se | |
| AS A | The second secon | 19 : " speed | 4:711 | and the second of the second |
| No. | 3, 3, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, | The second of the last of the | | Splits Fig. |
| The first was a first the same of the first that the same of the s | The second secon | | 483. 41 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | स्मानको १ हार्का जनसङ्ख्या १ व्यापुर्वे हार् |
| the state of the s | 1.000 | | | And administration of the last of the |

AND MANY TO THE PARTY OF THE PA

The average investment in drying facilities per fresh ton of fruit dried ranged from \$7.76 in Stanislaus County to \$46.90 in Alameda County (table 22). Considering five per cent as a fair rate of interest, these investment values give an interest charge of only \$0.39 per fresh ton in Stanislaus compared with \$2.34 in Alameda.

One of the principal factors associated with the average investment per ton is the total tennage dried. There is an irreducible minimum of equipment below which the operator cannot go regardless of the tennage dried. The eighty dry-yards were sorted into saven groups based on the tennage of all fruit dried in each yard. These that dried less than 50 tens per yard had an average investment of \$59.34 per ten (table 23). As the tennage dried per yard increased, the average investment per ten declined with two exceptions. One of these groups, the yards drying from 300 to 500 tens of fruit had one yard capable of drying 600 to 700 tens of fruit, but which, because of labor shortages, dried only 303 tens. As a consequence, the average investment per ton in this yard was high.

The investment per ton is also high for the largest dry-yards. This is due in part to one dry-yard that had considerable investment in expensive facilities designed to save labor and lower cash operating expenses.

The dry-yards that handled the larger tonnages of fruit did so primarily because they could dry a considerable tonnage of peaches (table 24). This fact precludes the possibility of some dry-yards increasing their tonnage dried. However, the operators of those yards that are located in areas where both apricots and peaches are grown, could reduce their overhead costs per ton by drying as large a tonnage as possible. For those who dry all their own production, contract drying and the purchase of fresh fruit are possible ways of increasing the tonnage dried.

Depreciation Rates. -- Each operator was asked to give his estimate of the probable length of life of each type of equipment used. This practice was followed because different operators subject their equipment to various kinds of treatment, with resulting variations in its useful life.

Cutting sheds were estimated to have an average life of 28 years (table 25). This life is equivalent to a percentage depreciation rate of 3.57 per cent per year. The range in ostimates, 5 to 100 years is somewhat misleading, in that only three operators estimated the useful life of the cutting shed at loss than 15 years and only one at more than 50 years. Most of the estimates were for 20, 25, or 30 years.

Sulfur houses were estimated as having a shorter life than cutting sheds. This was primarily because of the destructive action of the sulfur-dioxide gas. The average life was estimated at 19 years; the range from 4 to 50 years (table 25). This range is not out-of-line considering the fact that some of the sulfur houses are very lightly constructed, and designed to last only a few years, while others are of concrete or other material designed for permanence.

Trays were estimated to have an average useful life of 13 years, and boxes, 10 years (table 25). Estimates ranged from 5 to 40 years for trays and 3 to 45 years for boxes. The treatment received by these two piccos of equipment is particularly important. If they are carelessly thrown around, they soon become broken and useless.

The operators who used the large-size trays estimated the average life of their trays at 17.6 years while the operators who used the small-size trays considered they would last only 8.8 years on the average (table 26). The original cost of the three

The control of the second of t

A CONTROL OF THE CONT

and like the control of the state of the sta

grand as grade (grade) of the services of the

(4) And defining the formulation of the first of the f

d ifferent sizes of trays was about the same when their respective capacities are considered. The use of the shorter life on the smaller trays resulted in a proportionately higher depreciation charge on the smaller-sized trays.

The estimates of the length of life of the tracks were complicated by the fact that the steel rails used in many yards will undoubtedly outlast the wood ties. The average estimate gave this class of equipment a life of 29 years. The range, 10 to 100 years, is further complicated by the fact that a few yards had wood, or strapior rails, and that some had steel ties as well as steel rails.

Sulfur house cars were estimated to last 17 years. Some of these are all steel construction and will last much longer. Others have wood frames that need frequent replacement because of the action of the sulfur dioxide gas.

Miscellaneous equipment included a wide range of items and consequently the estimation of length of life covers a wide range.

Wage Rates. -- One factor which contributed to the variations in cost among individual dry-yards and among the different areas was the wage rate paid. For apricots, the wage rate for shed, yard, and supervisory work hired, ranged between \$0.40 and \$0.75 per hour in all the areas studied, and averaged \$0.51 in San Benito County as compared with an average of \$0.65 in Santa Clara County (table 27).

The operators were asked to place a value on their own labor in those cases where they worked in the dry-yard. In most cases they valued their time at a slightly higher rate than that prevailing for hired labor. This is in line with the common practice of paying hired workers five or ten cents additional per hour when they assume supervisory responsibilities.

Tests of significance of inter-area variation in wage rates and labor costs incurred in drying apricots were made. Wage rates appear to show significant variation among counties considered, but labor costs do not. It should be recalled here too, that the variation among counties in total costs of drying apricots was not statistically significant. That the difference in wage rates did not result in significant differences in costs per ton may be due to the fact that within each county there was wide variation in the amount of labor used in the individual dry-yards. Another conjecture would point to the possibility of greater efficiency in the utilization of more costly labor. Whatever the explanation, the finding reported here emphasizes the danger of assuming significant differences in either labor or total costs as a consequence of the existence of such differences in wage rates.

For freestone peaches, wage rates varied from \$0.30 to \$0.80 per hour for hired labor (table 28). The average rate paid hired labor in Stanislaus County was \$0.62 as compared with \$0.53 in the Fresno area. This difference in wage rates accounted for the fact that the cost per fresh ten for drying freestone peaches was lower in the Fresno area than in Stanislaus County.

The rates paid for cutting also varied considerably among the dry-yards studied. In order to study this variation in cutting rates it was necessary to group the dry-yards on the basis of the average weight of fresh fruit per box. For boxes containing 36 to 38 pounds of fresh apricots, from \$0.15 to \$0.20 w as paid (table 29). This same range in cutting rates was found for the noxt weight interval, 39 to 42 pounds. If we assume 50 boxes to the ton, this five-cent difference per box is equal to \$2.50 per fresh ton of apricots. For individual dry-yards, the range in cutting costs per ton of fresh apricots was from \$7.16 for one yard in San Benito

were the profession of the real states and the second , while the training is the market of the training of the state of the The second of th The second of th walling the best of the second The first the second of the se And the first of t The first of the control of the cont the many that the state of the property of the state of t And the second of Construction of the Constr provide a tap of the property of the months of the terms of the contract of th All the state of t The second of th Service of the servic The second of th

in the company of the Company of the last and the company of the c

TABLE 23

Average Investment in Drying Facilities per Fresh Ton of Fruit Dried, by Size of Dry-yard, 1942.

| Tonnage of all | | 1 | Avers | ge inve | stment | per fres | h ton d | ried | |
|---------------------|-------|------|--------|---------|--------|----------|---------|-------|--------|
| fruit dried per | Land | | Sulfur | Trays | Boxes | Tracks | Cars | Misc. | Total |
| dry-yard | | shed | houses | | | | | | |
| | | | | Do | llars | | | | |
| Less than 50 tons | 12.84 | 8.28 | 2.05 | 12.96 | 1.42 | 0.60 | 0.90 | 0.29 | 39.34 |
| 50 to 100 tons | 4.58 | 4.28 | 1.77 | 9.55 | 0.69 | 0.46 | 0.45 | 0.30 | 22.08 |
| 100 to 200 tons | 2.08 | 1.63 | 1.01 | 6.12 | 0.38 | 0.30 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 12.08 |
| 200 to 300 tons | 1.46 | 2.19 | 0.71 | 4.50 | 0.36 | 0.49 | 0.26 | 0.33 | 10.30 |
| 300 to 500 tons | 2.63 | 1.15 | 1.07 | 7.98* | 0.44 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.38 | 14.05* |
| 500 to 1,000 tons , | 1.24 | 0.57 | 0.46 | 2.80 | 0.27 | 0.46 | 0.22 | 0.14 | 6.16 |
| 1,000 tons and over | 1.49 | 3.57 | 1.73 | 5.81 | 0.75 | 0.83 | 0.56 | 0.92 | 15.66 |
| All dry-yards | 2.26 | 2.46 | 1.18 | 5.91 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.37 | 0.45 | 13.67 |

^{*} One dry-yard in this group had tray capacity far in excess of the tonnage dried. / Includes one yard with considerable investment in labor-saving equipment.

TABLE 24

Average Tonnage of Fruit Dried per Dry-yard, 81 Dry-yards, Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| Total tons | | | Average | tonnage dr: | ied per d | ry-yard | |
|---------------------|-----------|----------|----------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------|
| fresh fruit | Dry-yards | Al1 | Apricots | Freestone | Cling | Prunes | Other |
| per dry-yard | | fruit | | peaches | peaches | | |
| | Number | | | Tons | | | |
| Under 50 tons | 16 | 26.04 | 18.49 | 7.30 | | 0.25 | |
| 50 to 100 tons | 25 | 71.55 | 33.54 | 26.39 | 1.29 | 8.50 | 1.83 |
| 100 to 200 tons | 17 | 146.42 | 31.80 | 79.80 | 12.29 | 22.53 | |
| 200 to 300 tons | 10 | 247.42 | 38,45 | 164.92 | 15.05 | 29.00 | |
| 300 to 500 tons | 5 | 330.90 | 88.49 | 177.34 | 36.32 | | 28.75 |
| 500 to 1,000 tons | 5 | 597.31 | 99.28 | 404.34 | 93.69 | | |
| 1,000 tons and over | 3 | 1,508,03 | 366.23 | 791.73 | 130.17 | | 219.90 |

^{*} Includes pears, grapes, and nectarines.

| | Control of the second of the s | |
|--|--|---|
| | මේ සහ ක්රීම් වූව ද දැකි විසින් සහ | |
| | or protest to a series to the series of the | |
| | | |
| and the same of the same of the same of | the state of the s | |
| | | |
| The same of the same of the same | The state of the s | |
| | | |
| | and the second state of the second se | |
| S | and the same and the same form on the same and the same a | |
| | | |
| | | |
| A STATE OF THE STA | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | And the second s | 4 |
| and the second second | | |
| | The state of the s | |
| and the second of | The state of the s | |
| 415 TO 10 TO | | |
| | the first of the control of the second of the control of the contr | |





TABLE 25

Operator's Estimates of the Length of Life of Drying Equipment, 81 Dry-yards, Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| Items of | Estimated life | | |
|---------------|------------------|----------|--|
| equipment | Weighted average | Range | |
| | Years | 3 | |
| Cutting shed | 28 | 5 - 100 | |
| Sulfur houses | 19 | 4 - 50 | |
| Trays | 13 | 5 - 40 | |
| Boxes | 10 | 3 - 45 | |
| Tracks . | 29 | 10 - 100 | |
| Cars | 17 | 5 - 50 | |
| Miscellaneous | 16 | 2 - 47 | |

TABLE 26

Relation of Size of Tray to Original Cost and Length of Life, 80 Dry-yards, Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| Size of tray | Trays | Original cost per tray | Estimated length of life |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Number | Dollars | Years |
| 3 x 8 feet 3 x 6 feet 2 x 3 feet | 117,015* 51,072 270,859 | 0.819 0.609 0.189 | 17.6 13.1 8.8 |

^{*} Original cost not available on one dry-yard that had 800 trays.

A the state of the

| The second of th | A | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| The second of th | | | The state of the s |
| The second of th | 1.16 | to the region of a rank of the state of the | |
| | The second of the second | E. T. Springer and the Springer & Second | a complete and descripting a great and a second and a second |
| | | 1, | |
| 1001-01 | | | 15 |
| 6.A + | | | |
| | 1 | 111. | |
| | | | |
| of emails | | 244 | |
| , ;= =; | | ν; | |
| The second second second second second | | | |
| | An organization and an organization of | the product of the production | with a to prove |

16 100

and the first of the standard
| At all little to | | and the second s | |
|--|---------|--|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | The second secon | |
| | | The April | |
| | | | |
| | (2 d. · | | |
| | | | |
| | | | S and S |
| | | 47K+, 8+ | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| A Company of the Comp | | 11. 25.2 | at the same of the |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

and a king of the filler regarded to the Justification of the contract the file

TABLE 27

Hours of Shed, Yard, and Supervisory Labor at Different Wage Rates,
Apricots, Selected Areas, California, 1942.*

| Rate per hour | San Benito | Alameda | Solano | Stanislaus | Santa Clara |
|---|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|--|
| Hired labor: \$0.40 0.50 0.56 0.60 0.65 0.70 0.75 | 4,094.2 259.0 336.5 | 781.5 1,536.0 | 307.5 1,819.5 1,924.5 1,367.5 1,004.0 | Hours 2,169.0 773.0 2,648.5 23.0 152.0 | 140.0 462.0 2,502.3 1,240.8 1,417.2 230.0 |
| Total hours | 4,689.7 | 3,866.7 | 6,423.0 | 5,765.5 | 5,992.3 |
| Total cost Cost per hour | \$2,390.45 \$ 0.51 | \$2,066.82 \$ 0.53 | \$3,564.32 \$ 0.56 | \$3,227.70 \$ 0.56 | \$3,759.44 \$ 0.63 |
| Operator's labor: \$0.50 0.55 0.60 0.65 0.70 0.75 0.80 | 267.5 270.0 | 208.0 152.0 320.0 | 272.0 115.0 150.0 | 225.0 | 518.0 |
| Total hours | 537.5 | 680.0 | 662.0 | 1,034.0 | 1,982.5 |
| Total value Value per hour | \$295.75 \$0.55 | \$463.60 \$0.68 | \$390.50 \$0.59 | \$662.65 \$0.64 | \$1,247.00 \$0.63 |

^{*} Comparable data are not available for Contra Costa County.

f Include 60 hours paid at rate of \$150 per month.

1 44 11

and the second s

| 1 - At - 1 | Siz. 1-181 47 (27. 10) | La servici Adda a to As A trail |
|--|--|--|
| The second secon | Shows and several seve | 24 (1) |
| 300 | of any states | 1.1. 0,8% |
| | | |
| | | |
| | 0, 2,1 1 3.51. | |
| | | |
| | | The same beautiful and the same |
| I | | |
| | | |
| | | A Section of the sect |
| 00,181,(1-1 | 44.05.00 44.05.00 | |

TABLE 28

Hours of Shed, Yard, and Supervisory Labor at Different Wage Rates, Freestone Peaches, Selected Areas, California, 1942.*

| Rate | | labor | Operato | r's labor |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| per hour | Stanislaus | Fresno | Stanislaus | Fresno |
| | | Ho | urs | |
| \$ 0.30 | 159.5 | | | |
| 0.40 | 536.5 | | | |
| 0.45 | 70.0 | 1,947.5 | | 00'00 |
| 0.50 | 722.8 | 5,091.5 | | 500.0 |
| 0.55 | 1,944.0 | 212.0 | | |
| 0.60 | 24,681.7 | 2.535.9 | 1.417.5 | 60.0 |
| 0.65 | 834.5 | 911.0 | 324.0 | |
| 0.70 | 3,166.4 | 185.0 | 150.0 | |
| 0.75 | 4.368.7≠ | | 910.9 | |
| 0.80 | 827.7 | | | |
| 0.85 | | | | 720.0 |
| 0.875 | | | 200.0 | |
| Total hours | 37,311.8 | 10,882.9 | 3,002.4 | 1,280.0 |
| Total cost Cost per hour | \$23,236.15 \$ 0.62 | \$5,779.38 \$ 0.53 | \$2,018.08 \$ 0.67 | \$898.00 \$ 0.70 |

^{*} Comparable data are not available for the Brentwood-Winters area.

[/] Includes 130 hours paid at rate of \$125.00 per month.

⁷ Includes 260 hours paid at rate of \$200.00 per month.

....

| | great residence in the state of |
|--|--|
| | and the second second |
| The second secon | and the second of the second o |
| The same of the sa | |
| The state of the s | 44 |
| | |
| The second of th | j. |
| | |
| | |
| January Company of the Company of th | |
| The second secon | |
| | |
| | Note that the second |

to the second of
The interpretation of the contraction of the second contraction of the

TABLE 29

Boxes of Apricots Cut at Different Rates of Pay, Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| Rate | Pounds of fresh apricots per box | | | | | |
|---------|----------------------------------|---------|----------------|---------|---------|--|
| per | 36 - 38 | 39 - 42 | 44 - 46 | 47 - 50 | 54 - 60 | |
| box | | | Number of boxe | s cut | ō | |
| \$ 0.15 | 5,824 | 19,312 | | | | |
| 0.16 | 2,122 | 4,221 | | | | |
| 0.17 | 8,118 | 2,991 | | | | |
| 0.18 | 2,759 | 4,173 | | 6,781 | **** | |
| 0.20 | 1,882 | 58,362 | 12,208 | 24,011 | | |
| 0.21 | | | | 4,230 | | |
| 0.25 | | | 1,672 | 7,808 | 5,892 | |
| 0.27 | - | | | | 1,809* | |
| 0.30 | | | | 3,434 | | |
| 0.35 | | | | *** | 571 | |

^{*} Paid \$0.25 per box plus \$19.50 for transportation of cutters.
Paid \$0.25 per box plus \$55.00 for transportation of cutters.

TABLE 30

Boxes of Peaches Cut at Different Rates of Pay, Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| Rate | Pounds of fresh peaches per box | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------|---------|--|--|
| per | 36 - 38 | 39 - 42 | 43 - 45 | 47 - 53 | | |
| box | | Number of boxes cut | | | | |
| Freestone peaches: | | | | | | |
| \$0.055 | | | 2,480 | | | |
| 0.06 | | | | 7,719 | | |
| 0.07 | | | 9,010 | 9.473 | | |
| 0,075 | 13,213 | | | | | |
| 0.08 | | 34,599 | 3,459 | 10,148 | | |
| 0.09 | | 48,338 | 10,437 | | | |
| 0.10 | 6,326 | 44,140 | 140,995 | 26,809 | | |
| 0.14 | | | | 6,192 | | |
| Clingstone peaches: | | | | | | |
| \$0.15 | 1,510 | | | | | |
| 0.16 | 14,914 | 3,349 | | | | |
| 0.18 | 1,735 | 3,564 | 960 | 433 | | |
| 0.20 | | 18,581 | 21,875 | | | |

The first of the second of the

| | | | | -grann- | |
|-----|------------|------|--------|---------|-------|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | to the | | 1 11 | | 11.0 |
| | | | 1 32 4 | | |
| | | | | | |
| 400 | 179.0 | | ETT. 6 | | |
| 21 | 1207 100 1 | 100 | 00.1 | 500.0 | |
| | Carl 1 | , . | | m =- | |
| | - P. P. | | 0.4 | | .) |
| 4.1 | | | - | | 17.7 |
| 1 1 | 14. | | | | • |
| | | | | | |
| | 5 1.410 | 1.16 | ex ap- | - W | 11 +- |

we done to this discontract to the first outside the figure of T

12-8-12

with 1/2 grading to some the solution of the solution of the solution 1/2 . Further $M \in \mathbb{N}$, where

| The American water | The second second | | all to the | ĵ. |
|--|-------------------|---|------------|--|
| AT AND | 30 ₄ . | ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ## | | 33 34 7 8 8 8 8 |
| The state of the s | | . 14 | | and a manage of the second sec |

County that paid \$0.15 for outting 42 pounds of fruit to \$12.00 for a yard in Solano County that paid \$0.30 per box of 50 pounds.

For peaches, both freestone and clingstone, there was also considerable variation in the prices paid per box and also in the fresh weight of fruit per box (table 30).

While average hourly wage rates, average labor costs per fresh ton, and average total costs of drying freestone peaches were lower in the Fresno area than in Stanislaus County, only the differences in wage rates and labor costs were found to be statistically significant. Thus, the significant difference in labor cost per ton did not result in a significant difference in total cost between the two areas. A possible explanation of this fact may be found in the happenstance that interest and depreciation costs per ton were higher in the Fresno area and tended to offset the lower labor costs which this area had.

Data are available showing the wage rates paid by five operators of apple driers. The average wage rates for all of the labor ranged between \$0.53 and \$0.70 per hour, with four driers having averages of \$0.61, \$0.62, \$0.62, and \$0.63 respectively (table 31). Persons operating the peeling machines and doing the trimmings were generally paid the lowest wages while the supervisory labor in all driers was valued at \$1.00 per hour. Drier operation commanded the second highest wages in all but the Number 3 drier, whose receiver was paid \$0.90 per hour.

Labor, Equipment, and Material Requirements

Any plan that contemplates the drying of a larger tonnage of cut fruit than was dried in 1942, must take into consideration the labor, equipment, and material requirements of the task.

Labor Requirements. -- Labor should be considered first. It is extremely important in the drying operation, and even in 1942 some areas reported difficulty in obtaining sufficient workers.

Two kinds of labor are used in the drying of apricots, peaches, and pears; workers who are paid by the hour and workers who are paid by the box. Considerable information was obtained from the dry-yards studied as to the number of hours worked by the first type of worker, but very little was obtained about the second. However, using the data that are available, we find that in 1942, the drying of a fresh ton of apricots required 50.43 hours, freestone peaches required 20.61 hours, and cling stone peaches, 28.85 hours (table 32). The drying of a fresh ton of pears required 29.04 hours (table 33).

Only five of the eleven apple drier operators kept a record of the hours of labor used during the 1942 season. One of these driers was converted from hand-peeling machines to power-peeling machines between the Gravenstein and the late-variety season, and separate costs kept for each season. Accordingly, in the table, the operations of this plant are treated as though there were two driers.

The three plants using power-peeling machines, required fewer hours of labor por ton of fruit dried than did the other plants (table 34). The most efficient plant equipped with hand-peeling machines required 92 hours per dry ton for the peeling and trimming operations compared with 70 hours per dry ton for this same work in the least efficient plant equipped with power-peeling machines.

SECURITION OF THE WHITE AND AREA

The second of th

with and high with the state of the

The state of the control of the cont

The second of th

The second secon

TABLE 31

Average Wage Rates for Different Kinds of Work, 6 Selected Driers, Sebastopol and Watsonville Areas, California, 1942.

| | Driers | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Nature of work | No. 1 | No. 2 | No. 3 | No. 4 | No. 5 | No. 6 | | | | | | | | |
| P . 1 . | Wage rate per hour | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Receiving Poeling and trimming Drier operation Packing Supervision | 0.65 0.50 0.80 0.60 1.00 | 0.55 0.54 1.00 0.50 1.00 | 0.90 0.50 0.76 0.70 1.00 | 0.75 0.65 0.95 0.75 | 0.62 0.60 0.71 0.59 | 0.55 0.47 1.00 0.50 1.00 | | | | | | | | |
| All work | \$ 0.61 | \$ 0.62 | \$ 0.63 | \$ 0.70 | \$ 0.62 | \$ 0.53 | | | | | | | | |

TABLE 32

Hours of Labor Required per Fresh Ton for Drying Apricots and Peaches, Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| Operation | Operation Apricots Freestone peaches | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Hours | | | | | | |
| Repair and maintenance Washing trays and boxes Cutting Shed, yard and supervision | 1.21 1.42 35.40* 12.40 | 0.76 1.03 11.33* 7.49 | 0.46 0.71 20.007 7.68 | | | | | |
| Total labor | 50.43 | 20.61 | 28.85 | | | | | |

^{*} Based on records covering 519 tons of apricots and 420 tons of freestone peaches.

[/] Based on estimates of dry-yard operators.

The state of the s

| | | A. | | | |
|-------|--|-------------------|------|--|--|
| | A service and the service and | | | and the second s | en traine de la company de la |
| | | Mar. 1 22 1 4 1 1 | | | the same of the same of |
| | | 1 1 1 1 | 0.40 | | rigation that for a |
| | | 07.7 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 32 4 05 1 Ma |
| 1,000 | 1/6". 1 1,00- | Other 1 | 57.4 | F1 .0 | |
| 1.1 | | 07.2 | 4 | | poten maseln |
| | The second secon | To The | | | we of the |
| | | - 1 | | THE PERSON NAMED IN | and the second s |

The state of the s

| and the second s | |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |
| And the state of t | , real #514 |
| THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY O | |
| | |
| A Constitution of the Cons | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| a mark of a street of any or a street or a | |
| | BUT PARTY PLUS TOWARD HA |
| the transfer of the state of th | |
| | a and seen factors additioned the |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 1.13 July 1 |
| | |
| | |
| 9 | and the grown of girls about the city of the first |
| | |
| and the first of the same of t | |
| | 18 1 18 1 18 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 |
| | |
| To complete the desirable of the second control of the second control of the second of | |
| to the residence and the contract of | |
| | |

to the control of the

TABLE 33 Labor Requirements for Drying Pears, Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| Operation | Weight of fresh pears | Total time worked | Time required per ton |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Tons | Hours | Hours |
| Cutting | 319.37* | 4,950.5 | 15.50 |
| Shed, and yard work | 2,691.23 | 33,780.0 | 12.55 |
| Supervision | 2,691.23 | 2,667.0 | 0.99 |
| Total hours per ton | | | 29.04 |

^{*} Data on cutting time available from two-dry-yards for a portion of the season only.

TABLE 34 Hours of Labor Required to Dry Apples, Selected Driers, Sebastopol and Watsonville Areas, California, 1942.

| | Driers | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Nature of work | No. 1 | No. 2 | No. 3 | No. 4 | No. 5 | No. 6 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | I | Hours | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hours per fresh ton: Receiving Peeling and trimming Drier operation Packing Supervision | 0.53 6.71* 2.45 2.19# 0.53 | 0.26 10.24* 1.75 0.54/ 0.65 | 0.43 8.22* 3.07 2.70# 0.87 | 1.26 14.29/ 1.65 0.56/ 0.51 | 0.70 11.53/ 1.51 2.69/ 0.41 | 0.87 14.94/ 1.43 0.80/ 0.54 | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 12.41 | 13.44 | 15.29 | 18.27 | 16.84 | 18.58 | | | | | | | | |
| Hours per dry ton: Receiving Peeling and trimming Drier operation Packing Supervision | 3.66 46.56* 16.97 15.20 3.66 | 1.82 70.33* 12.00 3.70 4.50 | 3.15 60.06* 22.46, 19.76 6.34 | 9.25 104.94 12.11 4.13 3.73 | 5.62 92.24 12.00, 21.53 3.30 | 7.26 125.11/ 12.01 6.66/ 4.50 | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 86.05 | 92.35 | 111,77 | 134.16 | 134.69 | 155.54 | | | | | | | | |

^{*} Power-peeling machines used.

Hand-peeling machines used.

Fruit packed in sacks.

A STATE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE

| The state of the s | The same of the sa | The light and the | and the read that the total the tota |
|--|--|--------------------------------|--|
| 1 8 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 | harden | 3.95 | 48 1 44 |
| the second of the second | The first of the second | - 1 18 1 a Champana and a com- | control grade de colony i man i salay en i in injuntanza pri i sur i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i |
| 7.47.6 | | Physical Company | 1.58. |
| | 7 3H. 3 | katulot,j Adikoniji | restore time of the second |
| The second of th | | | make him is different |
| *** | | **. | and was prived fuller |

the confidence of the confidence of a post of the confidence of th

security.

The interface of the state of t

| | | 17.5% | or ord she specially as a college | ***** | | on a find a state of the water of |
|---|--------------|---------|---|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | . Historian | | | | 1 . (| B D* |
| | * ** *** *** | 11.21.4 | | | | |
| 144000 | | 14.1 | 4.3 | 58,0 | 13.25 | a pot some contract. |
| | 100 | 1 | * 20.0 | *8 | 17. | space there will provide the |
| * 4 | | 3 .5 | 77.67 | 4.1 | CARACO 1 | out the district |
| | 100 | 100.00 | 45% | 4.1 | 124.4 | 1.114 |
| * | - 1 1 | 1 1 1 2 | (· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 10 + 10 1 | | ANTO FREE TE |
| . (. | | 1. | 4.8 * 11 | 17.85 | 19.30 | f. Sec |
| | | | | ordinar a second according | the second | separated that complete |
| 7. | 2 | 1.1.1 | d1. | | | अ न्य स ्था द |
| | T | 30 | 3. | W 14. 17 Y | 1.3.16 | TARBOLEVE POLICE OF A |
| | 4-1 | 250 | Y | W. at | Alexander of the second | सम्बंध स्वास्त्रक मुन्ता । |
| 1.74 | • . | | | | | 1. April 19 - 52 . |
| 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - | | | 114 · P. | Agrida de Sandra de | and the distriction | |
| 7 7 | | 4.4 per | 177.150 | 99430 | 1 | (this |

All our conference of the contract

A CONTRACT OF THE PARTY OF THE

Peeling and trimming required the bulk of the labor used in drying. Even in the most efficient plant, over one half of the labor was used for these operations. Considerable variation was reported in the hours of labor used for packing, depending upon the type of pack put out. The plants that packed in boxes for sale to the U.S. Army reported 15 to 22 hours per dry ton, while the plants that packed in sacks and sold to processors reported only 4 to 7 hours packing labor per dry ton.

It should be emphasized that these labor requirements are average figures. Individual workers will vary widely from these averages. This is particularly true of the workers engaged in outting.

It is interesting to examine the speed at which different outters work. Data are available covering the work of 89 cutters in one pear dry-yard during the week ending September 26, 1942. This was about mid-season and the yard was being used at capacity. Five cutters averaged less than 1.7 boxes per hour and carned, at \$0.20 per box, only \$0.30 per hour from their cutting (table 35). It was necessary for the dry-yard to pay them additional funds to make up the difference between this amount and the \$0.33-1/3 an hour required as the minimum wage for experienced women by the State Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 8a. At the other extreme there were eight cutters who averaged 4.79 boxes an hour during the week. The average of all 89 cutters was 2.88 boxes an hour, which enabled them to earn an average of \$0.58 per hour. Women employed by the hour in the shed, the yard, and the adjoining packing houses were being paid from \$0.55 to \$0.60 an hour, so that the cutting rate of \$0.20 per box was fair in comparison with the wages paid for hourly work.

Equipment Requirements. -- If any equipment shortage develops, it appears most likely that it will be a shortage of drying trays. Of the equipment used in drying, trays were the most important single item, representing 44 per cent of the average investment in drying facilities of the dry-yards studied.

Most of the trays used for apricots and peaches were one of three standard sizes; 2×3 feet, 3×6 feet, or 3×8 feet. One dry-yard reported using trays measuring 3×3 -1/2 feet. The dry-yards in Lake County all reported using 2-1/2 \times 8-foot trays (table 36). The small trays were most popular in the Fresno area, probably because they could also be used in drying raisin grapes. The large trays, particularly the 3×8 -foot trays, were the most popular in Alameda, Contra Costa, San Benito, and Santa Clara counties.

The number of trays required to dry a given quantity of fruit depends upon the capacity of each tray, and upon the number of times during the season that each tray may be used.

The approximate capacities of the various sized trays as reported by the operators who dried apricots and peaches are indicated in table 37.

The number of times during the season that each tray may be used depends primarily upon the weather, both as it affects the time of drying and the length of the harvest period. Data from a number of the operators indicate that trays can be used during the season about one and one half times 4/ for apricots and about twice for peaches. These figures were used in calculating the approximate drying apacity of

^{4/} By this statement "one and one half times" is meant the use of all the trays once and the use of half of the trays a second time during the season.

The mail of a country of the common of the state of the s

at one for the second of the control of the second of the

The provided from the control of the

And the relate of particular is a state of the relation of the second of the relation of the r

The first of the first of the control of the contro

and likewise First to Attack and the many of the second of

of an endorred is a paid to the countries. I the subject of the su

En 11 mars 11 mars and 12 mars

the control of the co

TABLE 35

Number of Boxes of Bartlett Pears Cut per Hour and Amounts Earned by 89 Cutters During the Week Ending September 26, 1942, Lake County, California

| Average number of boxes out per hour | Cutters | Hours worked | Boxes cut Number | Hours per worker | Boxes cut per hour | Earnings per hour* | Earnings for the week |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Less than 1.7 boxes 1.7 to 2.2 boxes 2.2 to 2.7 boxes 2.7 to 3.2 boxes 3.2 to 3.7 boxes 3.7 to 4.2 boxes 4.2 boxes and over | 5 14 16 22 21 3 8 | 163.5 480.0 688.0 833.0 882.5 129.0 241.5 | 248 930 1,663 2,378 2,975 503 1,157 | 32.7 34.3 43.0 37.9 42.0 43.0 30.2 | 1.52 1.94 2.42 2.85 3.37 3.90 4.79 | 0.30 0.39 0.48 0.57 0.67 0.78 0.96 | 9.81 13.38 20.64 21.60 28.14 33.54 28.99 |
| Totals for the week | 89 | 3,417.5 | 9,854 | 38.4 | 2.88 | 0.58 | 22.27 |

^{*} Based on the piece rate of \$0.20 per box.

TABLE 36

Tray Equipment, 84 Dry-yards, Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| Dry-yards | 2'x3' | 31x61 | 3'x3=1 | 3 'x3壹' | 2表81 | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--------------------------|---|---------|---------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Number | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | 1,000 | 20,600 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | 45,850 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | 168,000 | 5,850 | 2,600 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | 13,550 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | 22,190 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | 39,000 | 9,428 | | 1,750 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | 97,259 | 46,800 | 14,325 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | 44,500 | | | | | | | | | |
| 84 - | 304,259 | 63,078 | 119,115 | 1,750 | 44,500 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 6 18 12 26 3 | 4 11 168,000 6 18 12 39,000 26 97,259 3 | Num | Number | Dry-yards 2 t x 5 t 3 t x 6 t 3 t x 3 t 3 t | | | | | | | | | |

[/] Based on the hours worked multiplied by the calculated earnings per hour.

| 7 TU 37 | | | ************************************** |
|--|------------|--|--|
| 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 1 | 2. 2 20. C | | 2001 (12) (12) (13) (13) (14) (15) (|
| 10 S | | | |

And the registration of the first of the state of the sta

1 3 %

| | | | | | | | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|---|--|------|----|-----|-----|---------|------|------|-------|-----|------------|---|------|-----|-----|------|------|-----------------|--------|------------|-----|------------|--------------|------------|--|
| ÷ | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **** | | | | | | 60 | | | | -3 | - | | | | | | | | | | #F 84 ** * | | | W-10-1 A | - - | |
| 7 | | 3 | | | ٠. | | 1 | | | | | *** | | | ** | 1.1 | . 9 | | A 44 | . : | - | | | | | | |
| - | | • | | *10 | | - | | to be a | -000 | * ** | | | + 6.50 | | | | 12 | | | Mary 11 1 1 | 7 1115 | 71-1 | 194 | | | | |
| | | | | 1.00 | ,, | | | | | | 100.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | Mr. 84. 41 | | | |
| | | | | | | | . ~ | | | | | | | i | | . 7 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | ~ | | | | | | | - | Ü | | . (| 3 | - | - | | 3 | | | | ner. | |
| | 0.0 | | | | | - 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | 7 | | | | | |

| 3 | | | THE RESIDENCE THE PROPERTY OF FIRE | THE RESERVE TO A SECRETARY OF SAME | 1 M . 1 M . 1 M . 1 M | | |
|---|--------------|--------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| | * | 2.4 | 1 7 Kg | 3.50.7 | | | |
| | 1.7 | 4 4 | | 0.44 | 1 22 | 3 | . Topical |
| | | 2.5 | 1 4-613 | 0 | | Í., | retreat involunces |
| | | ** 100 | April 1 | 100 | | 41 | 1 1955 157 |
| | ** | 17.46 | | - | 201 | 6 | and the second |
| | 4.7 | 14.0 | | | Agra | 8.2 | and the sales of the |
| | | **** | the state of | 623 | | 1.67 | |
| | Transport of | | | 120,1 | 1.4 | 5.0 | 4. |
| | | | - Improve transfer our water | 2.7 | | . 4 | () |
| | 13,00 | 200 | All mark sizes | | | when the strain is the control | |
| | | | | | | | |

representative the configuration of the configurati

TABLE 37

Pounds of Fruit per Tray Reported by 81 Dry-yard Operators, Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| | Aprico | ts | Peaches | | |
|--------------|------------|----------|------------|----------|--|
| Size of tray | Yards | Fruit | Yards | Fruit | |
| | reporting* | per tray | Reporting* | per tray | |
| | Number | Pounds | Number | Pounds | |
| 2 x 3 feet | 10 | 12 | 21 | 17 | |
| 3 x 6 feet | | 40 | 12 | 58 | |
| 3 x 8 feet | 31 | 55 | 7 | 80 | |
| 3 x 3½ feet | 1 | 21 | | 30 | |

^{*} Some yards dried both apricots and peaches.

TABLE 38

Calculated Tray Capacity in Relation to Tonnage of Apricots Dried, 81 Dry-yards, Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| Area | calculated tray capacity of all yards | Fresh weight of apricots dried | Proportion of capacity used | Calculated tray capacity of yards drying apricots* | Fresh weight of apricots dried | Proportion of capacity used |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | T | ons | Per cent | Tons | | Per cent |
| Solano Contra Costa San Benito Santa Clara Alameda Stanislaus Fresno | 661 1,891 559 915 880 2,870 1,795 | 599 1,562 416 566 268 658 28 | 90.6 82.6 74.4 61.9 30.5 22.9 | 661 1,891 559 915 880 1,660 258 | 599 1,562 416 566 268 658 28 | 90.6 82.6 74.4 61.9 30.5 39.6 10.9 |
| Total | 9,571 | 4,097 | 42.8 | 6,224 | 4,097 | 65.8 |

^{*} Number of trays multiplied by $1\frac{1}{2}$ and this product multiplied by the pounds of apricots per tray reported in table 37.

[/] Calculated by the author.

with a property of the second

| 0.0011 | | | | | |
|--------|-------------------------------|--|--------|---|--|
| | - D. | | | 1 2 2 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | |
| | and the state of the state of | | | | |
| | | | | 3.0 | |
| | | and the second | | | |
| | 97 36 - | | 2.00 | | |
| | | were the second contract to the second | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 90000 | | the available test of the transfer of | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 5.4 | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | 7 | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | 91 17 | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | management to the terms of | Contract of Commercial Contract of | | | |
| | | | | They are a highest to | The state of the s |
| | | | • ". " | 2.4 | |
| | | | | | |

ign the lagranding of the graph of the state of the sta

| 131 391 | | | of Li Stable et a 17 | | (L) state of | |
|--------------------------|--------------|------------|----------------------|---------|------------------|--|
| | Fagina 1. Co | " co nestr | THE SWIMM IN | Ing Pa | Personal Control | |
| f sa | | | F 200 - 1 | 1 15 1. | 2 100 | |
| And the same of the same | | 1111 | Jain a. T | 27.5 | | Consumer that the control of the con |
| Table | C. C. | 132 | Section 1 | -6 | F1 11 | |
| 4.00 | 3.94 | thirt - | 3. 1.8 | 11.15 | 1000 | id soft in a return. |
| | | Maria Al | 0.15 | | | 4 |
| | | n - 1 | 4.5% | | i day's " | |
| (4) | | Vi 43, | 1.702 | - 60 | 1.7 | |
| | | | | | ria manare | |

There is the last of the second of the secon

the 81 dry-yards included in this study that dried apricots or peaches. This calculation gives an indication of the extent to which the trays were used at their full capacity. 5/

The calculated apricot capacity of the dry-yards in Solano County was 661 tors. In these yards, 599 tons of apricots were dried or, on this basis, the yards were used an average of 90.6 per cent of capacity (table 38). Some yards in Stanislaus County and in the Fresno area did not dry apricots so the calculated capacity of the yards that did dry this fruit are presented as well as the calculated capacity of all yards.

The calculated freestone peach capacity of all the dry-yards studied is presented in table 39. The Stanislaus County yards were used to 91.6 per cent of their calculated capacity.

The calculated capacities for drying freestone peaches of the Santa Clara, Alameda and San Benito yards are shown even though no peaches were dried in these yards. In 1942, apricots were trucked from Brentwood and from San Joaquin Valley points to the Santa Clara Valley for drying. It may be necessary to truck freestone peaches to these apricot areas if the entire freestone crop is to be dried.

It should be pointed out that these farms dried only a little more than one half of the apriors and peaches they produced (table 40). Even if labor were available, the present tray equipment would have to be augmented if a much larger tonnage were to be dried.

It has been suggested at various times that paper tray liners be used. The advocates of this plan claim the trays will not need washing and that when the fruit is partly dried, several paper tray liners can be transferred to one wooden tray and several wooden trays thus released sooner than would otherwise be the case. Of the 31 dry-yards studied, paper tray liners were used in only one. The operator reported that the paper stuck to the individual pieces of fruit and had to be very laboriously removed by hand. This characteristic of paper should be investigated thoroughly before paper tray liners are recommended to growers as a means of alleviating their tray shortages.

The equipment other than trays appears to be adequate in most cases. The amount of land set aside for dry-yard purposes may be too small on some farms, but it can be augmented by spreading trays on ditch banks, in young orchards, and on other open spaces. These practices, if extensively followed, however, will require more labor. If the cutting-shed facilities are inadequate, the cutting can be performed in the open. The cutters should be protected from the sun, either by placing the cutting tables under shade trees, or by the erection of some type of sun-shade.

Sulfur-house facilities can be made to serve a larger tonnage of apricots and peaches by outting down the length of time each car is in a sulfur house. Many operators follow the practice of leaving the fruit in the sulfur house overnight. An exposure to the sulfur fumes of three hours for apricots and four hours for peaches is recommended. 6/

^{5/} If in any given area, the season is such that these factors, one and one half for apricots or two for froestone peaches, do not express accurately the number of times that the trays can be used in drying these fruits, other factors can be substituted.

^{6/} Long, J.D., E.M. Mrak, and C.D. Fisher. Investigations in the sulfuring of fruits for drying. University of California, Agr. Exp. Sta. Bul. 636. p.27. July, 1940.

The state of the s

was affections in the production of the production of the property of the production
And the state of t

The state of the s

The second particles of the se

The second secon

TABLE 39

Calculated Tray Capacity in Relation to Tomage of Freestone Peaches Dried, 81 Dry-yards, Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| Area | Calculated capacity of all yards* | Fresh weight of freestone peaches dried | capacity used | Calculated capacity of yards dry- ing peaches* | Fresh weight of freestone peaches dried | |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|------------------------------|
| | To | ns | Per cent | Tons | | Per cent |
| Stanislaus Solano Fresno Contra Costa Santa Clara Alameda San Benito | 5,514 1,262 3,403 3,668 1,775 1,706 1,084 | 5,050 804 1,770 1,442 0 | 91.6 63.7 52.0 39.3 0.0 0.0 | 5,514 989 3,403 3,528 | 5,050 804 1,770 1,442 0 | 91.6 81.3 52.0 40.8 |
| Total | 18,412 | 9,066 | 49.2 | 13,434 | 9,066 | 67,5 |

^{*} Number of trays multiplied by 2 and the product multiplied by the pounds of peaches reported in table 35.

| | | | 7774 | | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|----------|--|-----------|
| 10 1.3 | 8 1 1 | | .a. | | a de la companya de l | |
| •0 | | The state of the s | Avanta . | erene (M | | |
| s de | | | | | | 1.164 |
| | | 75 (4) 1 | | | | |
| | | en e emplement application | en e | 3 | 11. | A company |
| | A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH | Hall I. T. | | | | A en |

and the state of the substitution of the state of the sta

TABLE 40

Utilization of Apricots and Peaches on Farms Included in Study, Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| | | | Proportion | |
|-----------|---------------------|---|--|---|
| Farms | | Consumed | Sold to | Dried |
| reporting | production | fresh | canneries | |
| Number | Tons | | Per cent | |
| 64 | 6,366.3 | - 19.8 | 26.5 | 53.7 |
| | 13,070.9 | 20.3 | 25.9 | 53.8 |
| 12 | 3,982.6 | 0.0 | 88.2 | 11.8 |
| | reporting Number | reporting production Number Tons 64 6,366.3 46 13,070.9 | reporting production fresh Number Tons 64 6,366.3 19.8 46 13,070.9 20.3 | Farms Total production Consumed fresh Sold to cannorios Number Tons Per cent 64 6,366.3 19.8 26.5 46 13,070.9 20.3 25.9 |

TABLE 41

Sulfur Used per Ton of Apricots and Peaches, 81 Dry-yards, Selected Areas, California, 1942.

| Crop | Fresh | Sulfur | Cost of |
|---|-----------|-------------|---------|
| | weight of | used | sulfur |
| | fruit | per ton of | per 100 |
| | dried | fresh fruit | pounds |
| | Tons | Pounds | Dollars |
| Apricots Freestone peaches Clingstone peaches | 3,914.95 | 9.01 | 3.95 |
| | 8,196.84 | 7.67 | 3.75 |
| | 1,376.73 | 9.91 | 3.73 |

The first section of the section of

| | | *************************************** | | · | l wer | en and | | | |
|--|-------|---|---------|--------------------|-------|--------|---------------|---------------|------------------------------|
| | | | 7 | Sign of the second | 11.43 | ij ija | ge, " i hasid | ىلەرىمەتلىرلى | t mitrosofa fin Norce at man |
| | | | 3. i.e. | | : | 28 | 200 | | |
| | 1 - 5 | | | | | 1 | Na Na III | | periodical territorial |

Operation Progress for a finite continuous describes of a solution and describes of a solution.
 Operation of a solution of a solution of a solution of a solution.

| | | the many to the Wilder or Will four and World's | Apriles and a second second second second second |
|--|---|---|--|
| 7 / 10 - 1 | 148 . The Top 1 and 2 | 19. % | |
| TWO ARE LESS TO A STATE OF | ★ 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | "我才不是好了。" | |
| | 30 84 % 5 3 4 | \$1.32 S | Cent Track |
| | altonia de ma | 2. 2. | |
| The state of the s | L 7.891 | All II | And the world to the same two |
| *** | F 42 16 6 3 | to the first | |
| 11.00 | FF | The U auto | a protection of the |
| 37.1 | $\hat{P}_{2,4,5}$ | W. I. T. Sales | |
| | | | |
| the part of the contract of the part of the contract of the co | | there are a great to seeming your management continued to | ANTANAS ANTANAS ANTANAS PARAS ANTANAS |

A shortage of tracks and cars may be encountered in drying a greatly increased tonnage. It may be necessary to spread trays from trucks rather than using the conventional tracks and-car method in order to alleviate this shortage.

Material Requirements. -- Sulfur is the only material used for which quantitative data are available. The dry-yards studied used 9.01 pounds of sulfur per fresh ton of apricots, 7.67 pounds per fresh ton of freestone peaches, and 9.91 pounds per fresh ton of clingstone peaches (table 41).

Repair material, principally tray shook and nails, will be required to keep prosent equipment in usable shape. It is difficult to estimate the quantity required because the demands of individual dry-yards vary markedly.

The Proof of the state of the s